

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1876.

I.—THE PREACHER'S NEED OF MENTAL AND MORAL
SCIENCE.

"Now when he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day, many believed in his name, when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man."—JOHN ii, 23-25.

NO other teacher has touched so many chords in the human soul as Jesus of Nazareth. No other has struck the chords that he has touched, with such power. Innumerable are the intellects that he has stimulated to activity, the consciences that he has quickened, the wills that he has strung with high resolve, the fountains of affection that he has opened, and the streams of sympathy that he has caused to flow. His influence, beginning with his first utterances as a teacher, has continued to increase, and, in widening circles, is now passing to the confines of the world.

We may well inquire, What is the explanation of this power so pervasive and so permanent? Adequately to answer, one must sum up all the elements of Jesus' nature and life. It meets the present purpose to say, "He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man." A condition of the power of his appeals to man, is his knowledge of man. How many are the evidences of this power found in the Gospels! These

writings abound with such passages as these: "Jesus knew their thoughts;"* "He knew who should betray him."† What is more, his words show that he possessed this knowledge. What pertinency in his questions and answers! What opportuneness in his lessons! His word is now a rebuke, now a maxim, now a probe to the conscience, and then again a beatitude, a warning, a parable, or a prophecy, according to what is needed. "The common people hear him gladly;"‡ the policemen sent to arrest him return saying, "Never man spake like this man;"§ while all wonder at the gracious words that proceed out of his mouth. No other teacher has so fully illustrated the proverb, "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver." Certainly, "he needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man."

Now, if the Great Teacher could not have done his work without knowing men, we may be very sure that the minister of his religion can not do his work without some of the same knowledge. It is hardly too much to say, the greater the preacher's knowledge of men, the greater will be his influence and usefulness. Without such knowledge how can he be prepared to instruct and move those who wait on his ministry? How shall he convict men of sin, and lay the basis of faith? How shall he know when to arouse, and when to soothe; when to alarm the conscience, and when to appeal to the affections or the fancy? The preacher must have a knowledge of the human soul, or be a bungler in his calling; and when he acquires this knowledge, he is cultivating the field of mental and moral science.

I. THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM AND THE SOUL.

In the first place, I shall argue the preacher's need of the mental and moral sciences from the correlation of the Christian system to the human mind. The elaboration of this argument requires that both the mind and this system shall be mapped out. Let me premise, however, that, for the most part, I must speak dogmatically, withholding the arguments upon which my propositions rest. Even in handling controverted points, I must avoid controversy, since time will not admit of such discussion. This is the less necessary from the fact that I am not here a teacher of psychology and ethics; my

* Matthew xii, 25.

† John xiii, 11.

‡ Mark xii, 37.

§ John vii, 46.

business is to show the preacher's need of these sciences; and the value of the discussion, if it have any, will be independent of particular views that may be advanced. You may prove incontestably that a statesman should understand political economy, and yet your own views of taxation and the currency may be wholly wrong.

Man may be divided into two parts—matter and spirit, body and mind. He is not two natures, but one nature; not two beings, but one being: said nature, or being, consisting of a physical and a non-physical part. These parts pass into each other, so that we can not practically separate the one from the other; but they may be, and must be, separated for many of the purposes of thought. As the sciences of the mind deal with the body only so far as that is correlated with the mind, we may dismiss it from further consideration. The mind is generally divided into the intellect, the sensibility, and the will. The intellect is lowest, and conditions the sensibility; while the sensibility, thus conditioned, itself conditions the will. These faculties yield as results knowledge or cognition, feeling (under the two genera of pleasure and pain), and choice. Accordingly, the mind, or soul, or spirit (for the terms are interchangeable), exerts three kinds of activity—it knows, it feels, it chooses. Originally propounded by Kant, in the "*Critique of the Judgment*," this division has been almost universally adopted by those writers who believe in mental faculties at all. Sir William Hamilton illustrates the nature and correlation of the three activities by a common example. Before quoting the passage, however, let me add that Hamilton adds desire to will, under the third head:

"I see a picture. Now, first of all, I am conscious of perceiving a certain complement of colors and figures; I recognize what the object is. This is the phenomenon of cognition, or knowledge. But this is not the only phenomenon of which I may be here conscious. I may experience certain affections in the contemplation of this object. If the picture be a masterpiece, the gratification will be unalloyed; but if it be an unequal production, I shall be conscious, perhaps, of enjoyment, but of enjoyment alloyed with dissatisfaction. This is the phenomenon of feeling—or of pleasure and pain. But these two phenomena do not yet exhaust all of which I may be conscious on the occasion. I may desire to see the picture long, to see it often, to make it my own; and perhaps I may will, resolve, or determine so to do. This is the complex phenomenon of will and desire."*

The intellect, or knowing faculty, is capable of division. Different divisions have been propounded, but we will follow the one that

* "*Metaphysics*," Lecture XI.

makes four species—the intuitive, presentative, representative, and elaborative faculties. Their products are intuitive, presentative, representative, and thought knowledge.

The power, or faculty, of intuition gives what are called the intuitions. Here belong the ideas of being, space, time, and causation, as well as proper axioms. "All our knowledge," says Kant, "begins with experience, but not all knowledge springs from experience." He excepts the class of ideas just named. "They are not born in us," says Dr. Hopkins; "but as we are born with eyes, so that, when the occasion is given, we see, so we are born with a capacity of forming these ideas, so that, when the occasion is given, we form them of necessity."* Hence, they are not formed by analysis and comparison; they are conditioned, but not caused, by experience. These ideas are called universal, because all men have them; necessary, because we can not think of man's being without them; *a priori*, because not caused by experience; rational, as proceeding from what is called *the reason*; intuitive, because they are discovered by the mind's peering into itself; simple, because incapable of analysis. Hamilton called them regulative ideas, because they limit and control the action of the mind; all mental acts being within the field bounded by being, time, space, and causation. It is proper to add, that the intuitions are the subject of vehement dispute, some writers even denying that we have them. They do not deny that we have the ideas just mentioned, but they hold that they come from experience, through the medium of generalization.†

The second variety of knowledge is the presentative. This originates in the two kinds of perception, the outer and the inner; or, as they are sometimes called, sense-perception and self-consciousness. Sense-perception gives us all of our immediate knowledge of the external world; its avenues, as the name denotes, are the five senses. Our immediate knowledge of the earth, the air, the sky, the sea, of human society, even of our own bodies, is perceptive. Under the form of self-consciousness, perception reveals to us the world of the

* "Outline Study of Man," New York, 1874, p. 74.

† Almost all writers on mental science make intuition the last dividing member of the intellect. Dr. Hopkins, in his "Outline Study of Man," has very clearly shown that this arrangement is wrong. "As elemental and conditional for all mental action, and for the action of brutes as well as men, their office is low, just as that of gravitation is low." "They are first in the order of nature, and are the lowest and most elemental; they are involved in all that come after, and are needed to explain them." (Pages 79, 83.)

soul. As we survey the outer world with the eye of the body, so we survey the inner world with the eye of the mind. In this way, we know the states and affections of the mind—its knowledge, its feelings, and its choices. The faculty that furnishes this knowledge is called the presentative, since it presents or exhibits knowledge to the intellect; it is also called the faculty of observation and of experience. The quantity of knowledge that it gives us is very great.

Next comes representation. This is the faculty that *re*-presents in consciousness (or in the mind) the knowledge first presented by perception. In the form of memory, it recalls and vivifies what was once known, but that, for a time, has been out of the mind. As fantasy, it revels in dreams and in castle-building. As imagination, it constructs ideals in commerce, in war, in statesmanship, in philanthropy, in poetry, and the other arts. In no one of its forms can it create new materials. It simply recalls and recombines what another faculty has furnished. Perhaps no other faculty of the intellect is so little understood by the common mind.

The last kind of knowledge is the elaborative, or thought. Its materials come from presentation, its forms from intuition. This faculty compares, judges, and generalizes. It forms concepts and judgments, and draws inferences. It is the arguing or reasoning faculty. Its field is truth rather than fact. Its instruments, or methods, are analogy, deduction, and induction. The presentative faculty gives us facts; the elaborative builds them up into sciences and philosophies. It is the highest exercise of the intellect, and is very properly called thinking; its product, thought.

This sketch must suffice for the intellect. We pass now to the sensibility.

The sensibility is the faculty of feeling; its field is the experience of pleasure and of pain. It may be said to be threefold: first, the physical sensibility, or the experience of physical pleasure and pain; second, the æsthetic sensibility, which ranges over the field of taste, the empire of beauty and deformity in nature and in art; last, the moral sensibility, through which we receive pleasure or pain from the actions of moral beings. Thus, every affection of the mind that can be called feeling is recognized by the sensibility. To be sure, the feelings are the objects of perception in self-consciousness; but, as such, they belong to the second great faculty of the mind. Without

this faculty, there could be no such thing as good, and therefore no idea of good. Hence, the sensibility is the faculty to which exhortation appeals. Arguments are for the intellect; motives, for the sensibility, and, through the sensibility, for the will. As intelligent only, man could perceive facts, outer and inner, could recall them by memory, and could build them into systems of knowledge by thought; but he could have no experience of pain or pleasure, no idea of ill or good. Had he intellect only, heaven and hell would, in point of feeling, be alike to him.

At last we reach the will, the monarch of the mind. This faculty is revealed under two powers, choice and volition—the power to elect, and the power to carry the election into effect. The first is spontaneous and free: it is the power that makes a man responsible. The intellect acts by necessary laws; so does the sensibility. Hence, there is no more moral quality in the intellect, or in the sensibility, as such, than there is in the combining of chemical elements, or in the evolution of a mathematical formula. But the will, acting as a choice, rises superior to necessary law, and binds man with the ties of obligation.

Man has only one mind, but this acts in three ways—it knows, it feels, it wills. It must not be supposed that these fields are closed to one another; in fact, they open into each other by numerous gateways; they interpenetrate and even overlap. The lower faculties are conditional for the higher. The soul rests on the body. The body reaches up through the action of the soul. The intellect conditions the feelings, and these again the will. As we rise in our study of man's nature, we must carry the lower powers with us to the higher. Knowledge flows into feeling, and the two into the will. In the language of Dr. Hopkins: "By the addition of the sensibility to the intellect, we have a new department for the intellect. The intellect gives us light simply; what has sometimes been called a 'dry light.' With the sensibility added, we have light and warmth blended, and a field for the intellect that covers the whole range of possible combinations of intellect and feeling where no conscious will or purpose is involved. With the will added, we have not only light and warmth, but the chemical rays. The action of will not only opens new fields to the intellect, but gives new materials and forms to the sensibility. It is here, and here only, that we find any thing of a moral character."*

*"Outline Study of Man," p. 248, 249.

Accordingly, many of the acts of the soul are highly complex and difficult of analysis; they are neither pure intellect, pure feeling, nor pure choice: hence, many of the difficulties of mental and moral science; hence, also, the intimate relationship of the two sciences. The science of certain mental states is Psychology; the science of certain others, Ethics; and, as the lower faculties condition the higher, so the study of mental science should precede moral. The student should never enter on morals, the science of duty,* until he has mastered psychology, the science of the intellect. Not only so, the products of the soul become more difficult of scientific treatment as we rise in the scale. Intuition, perception, memory, ratiocination, are pure intellect, and are understood with comparative ease; the ideas of good and beauty are mastered with more difficulty; and, when we reach such states as the moral affections and the religious emotions, we are dealing with matters still more difficult to understand. The nature and functions of conscience I can but think a harder problem than the nature and functions of consciousness; the one is an intellectual, the other a moral, state.

The human soul has now been mapped out in outline. Its greater divisions have been marked, and some of the minor ones also. Many of the latter have been passed over, for obvious reasons. Of the great divisions, the intellect has been most studied and most valued. At the same time, knowledge is the lowest product of the mind. Conscience is higher than consciousness; affection, than fact; choice, than thought. Concerning the comparative neglect of the sensibility and the will in our systems of education, I can not forbear quoting a passage from Dr. Hopkins, although it lies a little out of my path:

"It may, perhaps, seem strange to some that the intellect should be placed lowest, but it belongs there; and the order in which I have presented the different parts of our nature, presents, as I suppose, the order of the progress of the race when it has been reduced to a savage or semi-barbarous state, and would rise again. At first, men worship strength of body, physical energy. The man who had the greatest power of muscles was the hero. Even yet there are many with whom physical prowess is the great thing, and who hold those who manifest it in higher esteem than any others. The next step is the worship of intellect. Disputants and intellectual prize-fighters become heroes. Great debaters, pleaders, orators, writers, become the great men, irrespective of character. This is our present state. No nation has yet got beyond this. In our literary institutions it is chiefly the

* "The science that teaches men their duty, and the reasons of it," is Paley's definition of moral philosophy.

intellect that is educated, and in some of them more and more, with little or no systematic regard for the training of the higher powers. No doubt the time will come when this state of things will be looked back upon as we now look back on the ascendancy of physical force. Until the intellect is placed by the community where it belongs, and made subordinate to the sensibility and the will, we shall find that mere sharpness, shrewdness, intellectual power, and success through these, will be placed above those higher qualities in which *character* consists, and success through them. The intellect is simply instrumental, and belongs where I have placed it."*

A rapid outline of the Christian system will exhibit its correlation to the mind. There is not a faculty of the soul which has not its counterpart in Christianity. First of all, it is a body of doctrine, or a system of truth, and as such it appeals to the intellect. It is to be studied and learned like a science or a philosophy. It comes to man as historical and didactic knowledge. As history or doctrine, it appeals to perception and thought, calling them into vigorous activity; while no other body of teaching gives equal employment to the imagination, the highest form of representative knowledge. It also appeals to the sensibility. Without the sense of feeling, the promises and threatenings of the Gospel would make no impression on the mind. It also appeals to the will, giving man his best opportunity to exercise choice and volition. Its mandates are, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve;" "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." It appeals, too, to all the complex faculties. It sounds the conscience, convincing man of righteousness, of sin, and of judgment. It fills the sinner with alarm for his soul. It creates within him a dread of punishment and a desire for happiness. It arouses the affections, causing us to love Him who first loved us. In a word, no doctrine or faith has ever been preached to man that touches him at so many points. Science, both natural and mental, cultivates the intellect; moral philosophy analyzes the moral actions, and holds up the sanctions of the conscience; but it does not develop the power of religious faith, and its appeal to the will is comparatively cold and ineffectual. Moral philosophy is wanting in the love of Christ, the enthusiasm of humanity. It remains, therefore, for the Christian system to arouse every power,—to blend fact, thought, feeling, sentiment, and motive, into one complex whole, that stimulates every form of soul activity. The same comprehensiveness and variety mark the Biblical mode of teaching. Simple statement, logi-

* "Outline Study of Man," pp. 58, 59.

cal inference, parable, and allegory blend together. The strongest dogmatic teaching, the tenderest appeals, the sternest threatenings, are made to harmonize. That the author of human nature is also the author of the Bible, can be argued from the perfect correlation of the one to the other. Assuredly, if Coleridge is right when he says, "That is truth which finds me," Christianity must be true; for it finds us at a thousand points.

Such, roughly sketched, is the nature with which the preacher is to deal; and such, hastily outlined, is the system of truth which he is to handle. His work is to bring Christianity and the soul into relation, and he must do this so as to effect the largest results. He is to use the Bible as an instrument with which to discipline and culture men. He is to apply the most complex of systems to the most complex of natures. He must, therefore, have a profound knowledge both of the Bible and of the mind. While this proposition will be generally assented to so long as it is asserted in general terms, it will be very strongly objected to by some when it is defined to mean a training in the sciences of the mind. There is a class of men who will reason on this subject somewhat as follows:

"To teach men, you must know men, of course. The teacher must understand human nature in an experimental way; he must have a certain practical sagacity, or *tact*, in interpreting character; but this experimental knowledge, or practical tact, springs from knowledge of the world, rather than from an acquaintance with the sciences of the soul." In support of this view, it may be said: "Christ's knowledge of men was rather practical than scientific; he read men's thoughts, saw through their foibles, discerned their spirits."

To such reasoning it may be replied: "It is not without plausibility, and even force. A knowledge of man, in the common acceptance of the phrase, does not of necessity include knowledge of the mental and moral sciences; nor does a knowledge of these sciences always bring with it a practical knowledge of men. A man may handle men with great power, and know nothing of books on psychology and ethics; and he may be a mere novice in handling men, although immensely learned in such literature. After all, however, other things being equal, he will best succeed who has the best knowledge of the nature with which he deals. What is more, practical efficiency springs from knowledge. We talk about 'sagacity'

and 'tact,' as though they were innate powers. They are simply trained ability. Accordingly, he will best master his subject who studies it the most thoroughly and in the best way; and as the scientific is the best way to study a subject, it is more likely to lead to practical efficiency than the empirical. A man may practice land-surveying, and know nothing of geometry, if he can manipulate a chain and compass and apply a few formulæ. So he may sail a ship in entire ignorance of the science of navigation. But who would not prefer to put down his landmarks where a scientific surveyor said they should be placed; or to intrust his property—much more his life—to a sailor who knows his science as well as his art? One does not need to be a chemist or a physiologist to recommend bread as a wholesome article of food, or even to make it; but he will be the better physician for having some knowledge of chemistry and physiology.

"Again, Christ's knowledge of men, as we see it in the Gospel, is practical rather than theoretical; analogous to that which men evince in the affairs of life, though much more complete. Such knowledge is of great value to men. It tells a man when to speak, and when to keep silent; what to say, and what to withhold. But in Christ's mind it originated in a way very different from that in which it originates in our minds. His knowledge was like the knowledge of God. In accommodation to human modes of expression, God is said to see and to reason; but his knowledge is immediate, original, and intuitive. He never reaches conclusions by logical process; He knows all things by intuitive intelligence. Such is Christ's knowledge. Accordingly, he is said to have known 'from the beginning who they were who believed not, and who should betray him.'* This knowledge antedated experience and was independent of all data. How different is our knowledge! Our intuitions are few in number, and such as we have are awakened to life by experience. Almost all our knowledge comes from experience either immediately or mediately, by perception direct or by the way of reasoning. Man perceives phenomena, registers his observations, classifies his facts, and deduces from them, by a slow and painful process of inference, principles, and laws. In all the higher uses of the knowing faculties, he must return to the subject again and again, verifying his facts and testing his conclusions.

* John vi, 64.

And when he has finished his work and named the product *knowledge*, he is not blind to the fact that uncertainty enters into it more or less deeply. This is especially true of his knowledge of the mind. Nothing so eludes analysis as the manifestations of spirit; nothing is so impalpable as thought, feeling, and volition. This is why mental science is a vast field of controversy. Whatever we know of the mind, we know by observing the minds of others, by introspection, by analysis and verification, by patient induction. Accordingly, whenever we study it to any purpose, we are cultivating mental and moral science, whether we study it by immediate observation or through the medium of a book. Unlike Jesus, we do need 'that some one should testify of man.'"

Thus far we have been examining the correlation of Christianity to human nature in the broadest sense. Something must now be said concerning human nature as modified in particular individuals.

All men are built on what may be called the same general plan. They all have intellect, all sensibility, all will; all have consciousness, conscience, the natural and moral affections, and the religious emotions; all have intuitions, perceptive knowledge, memory, imagination, and thought; all have the ideas of pain and pleasure, of good and ill, of personality and responsibility. But two houses, very different, may be built on the same foundation, and even of the same materials. So it is with men. The world of man presents a variety equaled only by the variety of nature. No two individuals are exactly alike. One man is strong in intellect, but deficient in sensibility or in will; a second has a powerful sensibility, but is weak in one or both of the other faculties; a third has a cold imagination, but great argumentative power; a fourth has warm affections and quick generous impulses, but small sense of duty. One man will listen to argument, but can not be moved by exhortation; another will weep at some picture of distress, but, poor fellow, he can never see the logical relation of two propositions; still another will give money to a beggar, but leave his debts unpaid without sense of shame; a fourth is as just as Rhadamanthus, and as unfeeling. No man is full and strong at all points; at best, we are but fragments of men. Hence says Solomon, "Mark the perfect man." In short, if you should determine the number of spiritual qualities that enter into a man; if you should conceive of each of these as existing in a hundred different degrees of strength;

if you should multiply these two quantities together, and find the permutations of their product, you would not exhaust the possible types of men, and hardly exceed the real types. Now, if the perfect man should be brought into relation to Christianity, what would follow? He would be convinced by its facts, moved by its motives, stirred by its appeals to his conscience, and all with equal power. But how is it when the actual man is brought into such relation? He is acted upon with different degrees of power. His understanding may be convinced, but his feelings remain apathetic; he may have vivid conceptions of the New Jerusalem, but no sense of moral duty; he may weep at the story of the suffering Savior, but have no grasp of the Gospel as the wisdom of God; he may tremble at the threatenings of the Gospel, and flee the wrath to come, but have only a feeble hold on God as a Father. The fact is, men are bound to religion by different ties—one by reasoning, a second by love, a third by fear. Though men are acted upon by a variety of influences, few if any are acted upon by all influences in their full strength.

The bearing of the facts just stated on the work of a preacher is, or ought to be, obvious. In the first place, the evangelist must understand men in order that he may reach them. Provided he is equally master of all the elements of the Gospel, he will naturally use those that he can use to the best advantage. In preaching the Gospel, men must be individualized and differentiated, as children are in the family and in the school. The evangelist who approaches all men in the same way, who thinks there is only one kind of men, and acts accordingly, will have but indifferent success. Great powers of mind and great knowledge of the Scriptures can not overcome this defect. In the second place, successful pastoral labor rests on the same condition. That he may *teach* men, the pastor must *know* men—not man in his general character, but the very men he teaches. His business is to build up their natures, to make them full and strong in all points pertaining to morals and spirituality. His people are to grow in knowledge and in grace under his care. If the religion of some members of the congregation is logical and cold, the pastor must open up their sensibilities and affections; if others are highly emotional and impulsive, he must root and ground them in the facts and reasons of the Gospel; if others still are lacking in the ethical elements of religion, he must cultivate the sense of moral duty. Whether

an evangelist or a pastor, the preacher, to be highly successful, must touch every key in the organ of human nature.

Practically, however, the differences among men are not so important as they may seem. Although each one has his individual peculiarities, although John is John, James James, and neither Thomas, in nature as well as in name, still there are great groups or classes of men in which minor differences disappear. There is your matter-of-fact man, your sentimental man, your emotional man; that is, there is the man in whom one of these qualities is in the ascendancy, and whose character is described accordingly. And, certainly, if the preacher can not be fairly expected to know men by their individual peculiarities, as perhaps he can not be, it may be fairly demanded of him that he shall know them by their classes. He should be able to recognize the matter-of-fact man, the sentimental man, the emotional man, and know how to handle him.

Communities also have their characteristics. Different tones of mind are found in different places. A community's tone grows in part out of the inherited qualities of the people, and in part out of its general culture. A typical New England congregation demands logical precision and critical exactness in its teachers, but is rather indifferent, if not hostile, to warmth and color. The typical Southern or Western congregation, with its warmer feelings and more demonstrative manners, would freeze in the New England atmosphere. Then there are the traditional tones of thought, the special ways of seeing things, the local foibles and prejudices, that a preacher encounters. He is but a fool if he runs foul of these when he can avoid them. On Mars' Hill, Paul stood in the presence of an assembly, cultured, polite, with a habit of mind distinctly marked. What knowledge of men, what appreciation of his surroundings, what practical tact, what courtesy, in his address! He begins with saying, "You men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious" (not "too superstitious," as the common version makes him say). He then finds a point of contact between the Gospel that he preached and the heathenism that they practiced, in the inscription on the altar, "To the Unknown God." Him whom they had ignorantly worshiped, Paul boldly declares unto them. Having won their attention by his appreciation and politeness, he now saps the basis of their idolatry by proclaiming, that "God dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither

is worshiped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing;" and of their materialism, by preaching the resurrection of the dead. In the sequel, some mock, certain cleave unto him and believe, while others promise, "We will hear thee again of this matter."* Would the apostle have succeeded better if he had actually called the Athenians "superstitious," and had denounced the temples on the Acropolis?

Among an ignorant and superstitious people, the priest may control men through fear and authority; but the Christian teacher can not do so in any intelligent community. He must win men. Hence, he must know man in his general nature, and in his class and local characters. No man needs to have a mind more appreciative and many-sided. One great obstacle to the progress of Christianity in India is the profound philosophy of the cultivated Hindoos. We are so accustomed to regard the Hindoo as a pagan of darkened mind, that we overlook the fact of his having in his possession, handed down from the time of the Sanskrit theologians and poets, a metaphysics of remarkable subtlety and depth. How would Paul attempt to reach this people? Undoubtedly, by studying their mind, and seeking to discover some points of contact between their philosophy and the religion of Jesus. However it may be with the millions of India, I see no reason to expect that her scholars and thinkers will be converted to Christ, unless their culture shall be treated in some such appreciative and sympathetic manner.

Let me dismiss the first great branch of this argument with the remark, As well expect a man who has no knowledge of the science of music to play an organ of a hundred stops, as to expect him to bring the Bible and the soul into due relation who does not understand the nature of man.

II. BIBLICAL STUDY AND THE SCIENCES OF THE MIND.

The interpretation and systematization of the Bible rest on the mental and moral sciences. To a great degree, the Bible is historical; even the non-historical books, as the Prophets and Epistles, abound in historical matter. What is more, the religious history of man, as traced in the Bible, runs parallel with his secular history, as traced in historical memorials. These facts constitute the reason why the student of the Bible should be a good historian. As a

* Acts xvii, 23-34.

part of general culture, history has its value for him as for other men; but there is a special reason why he should be familiar with its materials and results, as also with its methods. For a similar though less cogent reason, he should have some training in science. But he must not fail to be versed in the sciences of the mind. This I hasten to show from the nature of the Book with which he deals.

The Bible is a book of literary memorials, written in different ages, in different languages, and by different men. Granting that it proceeds from one source, it is still marked more or less deeply by the peculiarities of its human authors and by the circumstances under which it was written. It must be handled like other works that are similar in their external features. It calls for the literary sense. What are some of the qualities of the successful interpreter? Largeness of heart, many-sidedness, catholicity of spirit; that sympathetic quality which enables its possessor to transport himself into other scenes, and to appreciate other systems of culture than the one in which he was reared. What was the spirit of the patriarchal world? of the Jewish? of the Roman and the Greek? What is the angle of observation from which different books and passages are written? What was the feeling that John struck at when he said to the Pharisees and Sadducees, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father?"* What was the feeling lying in the minds of the Nazarenes, that caused them to be "offended" in Jesus?† These may be poor illustrations, but they will serve to show that, in interpreting Scripture, the stand-point of the one who asks and the one who answers, of preacher and audience, must be taken into the account. Particularly in the Gospels, but also in the other books, series of events move back of what appears on the surface; and the successful expositor must be able to read and to show what is "between the lines." The ability to meet these conditions comes in part from historical knowledge of the Jew, the Greek, and the Roman, and of their habits of mind; but more largely it comes from the power to get into men's minds, and vividly to reproduce what took place centuries ago, or what takes place now in remote places. To some extent, the power comes from native tact, but, so far as culture can produce it, this quality comes more from the study of the mind than from any other source.

*Matt. iii, 9.

†Ibid. xiii, 57.

Nor is the argument yet exhibited in its full force. It has been remarked that, to a great extent, the Bible is historical, that its interpretation calls for historical knowledge and training. But its great purposes are ethical and spiritual. Even the historical parts look to religious ends; its facts are given, not on account of their historical interest, but on account of their spiritual value. Accordingly, its underlying basis is subjective, not objective. The appeal is to a nature the sciences of which are mental and moral philosophy. It follows, therefore, that the Bible must constantly be studied from a subjective stand-point. Some portions of Scripture are profoundly metaphysical; as, for example, the Gospel of John. What is more, some portions of Scripture are written to correct certain modes of thought on religious subjects; others, to expose certain errors of a philosophical character. Much of Christ's teaching is directed to overthrowing that religious habit of mind which sprang from the Jew's complacency regarding himself the chosen and approved of God; as much of Paul's is to correcting certain forms of doctrine arising from the combination of the Gospel with Judaism or Oriental theosophy. Much of both the Testaments was directed to particular individuals and communities, to meet their immediate wants; and no man can understand these parts unless he can enter into the culture and spirit of the individuals and communities addressed. What did certain of the Corinthians mean when they said, "and I of Christ,"* and what led them to say so? What led certain Jews to remind Jesus of those "Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices?"† No man can understand the Epistle to the Galatians, who has not studied that curious intermingling of Christian and Jewish elements which finally culminated in the philosophico-theological doctrine known as Ebionitism; nor can any man grasp Paul's meaning in the simple declaration, "We all have knowledge,"‡ who has not penetrated to a considerable distance that vast labyrinth of speculation known as Gnosticism. Once more, the Bible has a psychology and an ethics of its own. Profound books have been written to develop its philosophy. According to the Bible, how manifold is the nature of man? What is the "soul," and what the "spirit," of which Paul speaks in the First Thessalonians?§ What is the "heart," with which man is said to "believe unto righteousness?"||

* 1 Cor. i, 12.

† Luke xii, 1.

‡ 1 Cor. viii, 1.

§ v, 3.

|| Rom. x, 10.

What is the meaning of the words "mind," "heart," "spirit," "soul," "understanding," and "conscience," as they occur in the Bible? and do they always convey the same ideas? Only a profound philosophy can answer these questions. We call the Gospel plain, and say the Bible is an easy book; so they are from a certain point of view. But if any man supposes the Bible is a shallow pool, to the bottom of which any eye can see, he only shows his own shallowness. The profoundest book in the world is the Bible; far below the longest sounding-line, its depths reach downward to the infinite.

But it is time to say something of systematizing Scripture. The Bible is not a methodical book, in the scientific sense of the term. As revealed in the Bible, Christianity is not a theology; it is not a body or system of divinity; it is not, in the received sense, a plan of salvation. It is marked by the freedom of the spirit, rather than by the rigid forms of the letter. It contains doctrines and facts which are to be deduced from the language, and then combined into a body or system. Now, this deduction and combination are the work of the human intellect, as much so as the deductions and combinations found in science. Here we enter the field of theology, which may be defined as a scientific attempt to interpret, arrange, combine, and explain the materials of the Bible. Every distinct body of Christians has something of this kind; it may be simple and rudimentary, or complex and elaborate, but it is a theology.

Before showing the theologian's need of mental and moral science, it may be best to anticipate an objection. Outside of a few old-fashioned places, there is a general disposition to discredit theology. Practically, it is almost discarded as a useless thing. It is said that the Gospel is not divinity, and that the Gospel, as good tidings, can be preached without reference to systems of dogma. This evidence of change, whether of progress or not, we Disciples hail with peculiar satisfaction. We do not believe in theology, and have never dreamed that we had one. To be sure, we have a plan of salvation, but this we think wholly different. But it is a theology to all intents and purposes. It consists of a number of logical propositions arranged in a certain order. In the formulation, we sometimes use the language of Scripture, sometimes our own; but the result is a logically arranged scheme of doctrine.

Now, this scheme, as thus drawn out, is nowhere found in the
VOL. VIII.—11

Bible. We have made it, by selecting materials here and there, and by combining them in what we think their natural order. We think all the propositions contained in it are true. We think them put together in the order of their affinities. And so, perhaps, they are. But no apostle, so far as we know, ever preached one of our regular plan-of-salvation sermons. This scheme of doctrine may be more simple, more Scriptural and less speculative, more easily understood, than others; such is my own opinion; but it is an attempt of the human intellect to systematize parts of Scripture, and therefore it is a theology. This point being granted, of course all of my brethren are in favor of cultivating theological studies.* From one point of view, the prevailing tendency to disparage and discard theology is commendable; from another, it is to be regretted. Christianity is not bounded by any man's grasp of it. The Gospel may be preached, and generally should be, as the apostles preached it, as good tidings, not as a "system," or a "plan."

"Our little systems have their day;
They have their day, and cease to be;
They are but broken lights of thee,
And thou, O Lord, art more than they."

Theology is not essential to salvation, nor should it be made a test of fellowship in the Church. We do not impose our plan of salvation on the penitent believer as an article of faith. If he accepts and obeys Christ, we are willing to let our "plan" go. In this field we have done a noble work, and we may thank God that the religious world so generally is accepting the doctrine we have so long preached. But there is another side to the question, since theology may have its uses, and does have them, although it be no longer

*In the second volume of Richardson's "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," an account is given of the arrangement of the Gospel elements in the mind of Walter Scott. Scott has been in conference with Bentley and Osborne. "From this moment, Mr. Scott's mind seemed to be engrossed with the consideration of the consecutive *order* appropriate to the various items in the Gospel, and, being greatly given to analysis and arrangement, he proceeded to place them thus: 1. Faith; 2. Repentance; 3. Baptism; 4. Remission of Sins; 5. Holy Spirit. This view relieved at once his previous perplexities, and the Gospel, with its items thus regularly disposed, seemed to him almost like a new revelation. He felt that he had now obtained a clew which would extricate men's minds from the labyrinth in which they were involved in relation to conversion, and enable him to present the Gospel in all its original simplicity." (Pages 208, 209.) What Scott was doing was this: He was theologizing the Scriptural materials in relation to conversion. This transaction is probably as near as we can get to the formation of the new theology on that subject.

used as a confession of faith. Is there to be no more systematic thinking expended on the Bible? Will unconnected scraps and fragments of Scriptural knowledge answer the purposes of religious culture? While we are more and more methodizing other departments of knowledge, are we going to throw away religious method? A Christian may do his work in the world and go up to glory, having hold only of a Bible fact here and a promise there; but he can as successfully study plants, or rocks, or animals, without method, as he can the Bible. It may be considered a phenomenon for a Disciple preacher to recommend the study of theology; but it is time some one should say a word for this great department of knowledge.

Especially does the preacher need a theology. Of course, he should not accept it hastily, nor should he make an abusive use of it. He must remember that, so far as the form is concerned, it is man's work, and not God's. With these qualifications, I am prepared to affirm that the preacher needs a theology both to study by and to preach by. How else shall he understand the analogy of the faith? How else shall he discipline his congregation? Men are disciplined by knowledge thoroughly and systematically taught, not by odds and ends picked up at random. It is true that

"Our little systems have their day;
 . . . have their day, and cease to be"—

true that they are but "broken lights" of God, and that he is "more than they;" but it is also true that the world is governed by systematic thinking. "Say what men may," says Dr. Shedd, "it is doctrine that moves the world. He who takes no position will not sway the human intellect. Logical men, dogmatic men, rule the world. Aristotle, Kant, Augustine, Calvin—these are names that instantaneously suggest systems; and systems that are exact, solid, and maintain their place from century to century."* Let me add, it is my opinion, and one not hastily formed, that a solid and self-consistent theology is one of the great wants of the religious world at the present day. The "babbler" or "seed-picker," to use a word contemptuously applied by the Athenians to Paul, can not satisfy its demands for religious knowledge.

* "Homiletical and Practical Theology," pp. 26, 27.

Having shown the necessity of theology, it remains to point out its dependence on the sciences of the mind.

In the first place, theology is more nearly assimilated to those sciences in substance than to any other. On their speculative side, they deal with the theory of the mental nature; on their practical, they furnish rules for its guidance. Hence, the most useful spiritual analogies lie between religion and the spiritual, not the natural, sciences. In the second place, theology is dependent on them for forms and methods. Never yet has there appeared a theology that had not its philosophical body—sometimes Platonism, sometimes Aristotelianism, sometimes Lockeianism, but always a philosophical body. The creator of every theological system has his philosophical stand-point; Calvin his, Arminius his, Campbell his. Hence, you can never fully understand a theologian's system unless you can catch his philosophical point of view. We talk about men coming to the Bible with their minds blank; but such a thing never yet happened, and it never will happen. Men may come to it without strong prepossessions or violent prejudices, but not without habits of mind and tones of feeling. How different are the accounts that Augustine, Swedenborg, and Campbell give us of what they find in the Bible! Why? A material part of the answer is this: They differ materially in their philosophical views of human nature, of the spirit world, and of God. Theology, more than any other science, runs back into what Dr. M'Cosh calls "the region of fundamental principles; a region, no doubt, often covered with clouds, but where all the streams of science have their fountains."* Let a Bible student undertake to determine the nature and the relations of what in the Bible is called faith, purely questions of theology. What is faith? In what relation does it stand to the intellect? in what to the sensibility? in what to the will? Is it purely the intellectual effect of testimony? Does it differ in nature from our assent to the proposition, "that Alfred was a wise king," or, that "Alexander was a great soldier?" Or is faith choice from the will, conditioned by knowledge on the part of the intellect, and by feeling on the part of the sensibility? These are great questions that press for answer, though no attempt is here made to answer them. In my opinion, no man can answer them intelligently who does not do two things: he must study

* "Method of the Divine Government," New York, 1867, p. 76.

most profoundly the dogmatic statements of the New Testament in relation to the subject, paying especial attention to examples, and he must also minutely analyze the mind, and the effects produced upon it by the preaching of the Cross. He can not do either, especially the latter without a philosophical training. Practically, it is enough to know that preaching is the instrument by which faith is created. Speculatively—what is faith, and in what relation does it stand to the mind?—we need to know something more. Then, in what relation does faith stand to repentance? This is not a matter of dogmatic teaching, and we must infer an answer from all premises, Scriptural and psychological. The design of baptism is taught dogmatically, and is not, therefore, properly a theological question at all.

The necessary connection between philosophy and theology is admirably illustrated in the early history of the Protestant Reformation. The scholastic theology of the mediæval Church was based on the scholastic philosophy. This was Aristotle as interpreted by the mediæval schools. More than five hundred years had been occupied in compressing Christianity into the norms and categories of the Stagirite. The work had been pretty thoroughly accomplished when Luther appeared. The great Reformer's task was threefold—to emancipate Church life from ecclesiastical dominion, moral life from gross ungodliness, religious faith and theological opinion from the crushing weight of the scholastic system. For every blow given to the Pope, a second was given Aristotle. "I believe it impossible," said Luther, "that the Church can be reformed without completely eradicating canons, decretals, scholastic theology, philosophy, and logic, as they are now received and taught, and instituting others in their places." Aristotle was denounced as "a godless bulwark of the Papists." But after demolition came construction. In the words of Ueberweg, "In proportion as Protestantism gained fixed consistency, the necessity of a determinate order of instruction became equally apparent with that of a new ecclesiastical order." Melancthon, who had at first shared the feelings of Luther, selected the groundwork of the first Protestant theology. He said, "We must choose some kind of a philosophy which shall be as little infected as possible with sophistry, and which retains a correct method." "We can not do without the monuments of Aristotle." "I plainly perceive," he said further, "that if Aristotle, who is the unique and only author of method, shall be neglected, a

great confusion in doctrine will follow." Luther modified his earlier opinions, granting that Aristotle might be "useful as a discipline for young people in correct speaking and preaching." Thus Aristotle was elevated to the throne of Protestant theology; only it was the real, not the scholastic, Aristotle. Our just complaint against the Reformers is, not that they studied theology, or that they cast it in the Aristotelian forms; but that they overlooked the difference between theology and the Gospel, and bound their heavy dogmatic burdens firmly on men's shoulders.*

A striking example of the power of philosophical training in the field of Biblical study is found where some of us would least expect its presence—I mean in the life of Alexander Campbell. Mr. Campbell knew no philosophy of the mind except that of John Locke. This his father taught him with the proverbial thoroughness of the Scotch schoolmaster. Before tracing the influence of this teaching on Mr. Campbell's mind, a few words must be said by way of characterizing Locke's system.

Locke's philosophy is a species of a genius that is as old as the Greek philosophers. Plato believed that ideas exist before the several classes of objects, and that these objects become what they are by partaking of these ideas, while Aristotle believed that all the furniture of the mind comes through the senses. With these two great masters originated two schools of philosophy that have continued to this day—one higher and more spiritual, the other lower and more material. Locke belongs to the second group. He traces all our ideas to two sources—sensation and reflection. By "reflection" he probably means consciousness, though that is involved in dispute. His Continental disciples summed up what they understood him to teach in the formula, "There is nothing in the understanding that was not previously in the sense." Whether Locke would have adopted this formula, we need not inquire. Certainly, he found no place in his system for intuitions. A quotation from Dr. Hopkins concerning the tendencies of the two schools:

"The interest in this question is not merely speculative. If it had been, it would probably have died out long ago. It is mainly derived from the tendencies of the two schools. Connected with the origin of knowledge in sensation, there has been a tendency to materialism, to sensualism, to a low standard of morality

* For an account of the rise of Protestant theology, see Ueberweg, "History of Philosophy," New York, 1872, Vol. II, pp. 16-19.

and to the denial of a hereafter. Connected with what has been called the spiritual philosophy, or, sometimes, transcendentalism, there has been a tendency to idealism, to mysticism, to excursions into cloud-land, to forms of expression oracular and obscure, and to an undue exaltation of reason. Men have assumed as the product of reason what was not; they have made out of ideas received in this way, or supposed to be thus received, a kind of inspiration, and have become conceited and dogmatic.*

Now, Mr. Campbell's mind was matter-of-fact, rather than metaphysical; objective, rather than subjective. He took a strong hold of the Lockean doctrine. It was shrouded in no mysteries; it required little analytical power, in which his mind was relatively deficient. His mind assimilated it readily. Hence, the philosophy of sensation determined his view of things; and he constructed his theology from that point of view, as plainly as Augustine constructed his from an Aristotelian point of view, and Schleiermacher his from a transcendental. To be sure, he proclaimed that theology is not to come in the room of the Gospel, and in practice was always faithful to the principle. But the man who denies that Mr. Campbell's teachings are strongly colored by the Lockean philosophy, is a person with whom it is not worth while to argue.

In the debate with Mr. Owen, Mr. Campbell affirmed, as he always did, that the idea of God must have come by revelation, since "reason can not originate the idea of an eternal first cause."† He quotes Locke: "The simple ideas are the materials of all our knowledge, which are suggested and furnished to the mind only by sensation and reflection." He then goes on to show that this idea could not have come from either of these sources. Poor Mr. Owen, himself a sensationist, could say nothing but that the idea came from the imagination! The thoroughness and satisfaction with which Mr. Campbell hewed down this tree, can not have been forgotten by any attentive reader of this debate. That he was on favorite ground, is seen in the frequency with which he returned to the subject, running up and down the gamut of the Lockean philosophy in several speeches—sensation, memory, and reflection. It is worth remarking that, in this particular, Mr. Campbell went further than his master. Locke holds that the existence of God may be inferred from the perfection of nature; but the pupil declares that natural theology is founded upon a

* "Outline Study of Man," pp. 111 and 112.

† Bethany Edition, Vol. I, p. 116, *et seq.*

petitio principii, and scouts the idea of inferring God from nature. He finds no more place for intuitions than his master.

But again, the whole cast of Mr. Campbell's theological system is Lockeian. No previous teacher has placed so much stress on the proposition that facts, palpable, unmistakable facts, are the basis of the Christian religion; nor has any other teacher handled these facts with more clearness and power. He also had a remarkably clear and strong grasp of Scripture, as a thing *written*, and capable of being understood. Hence, his habit of bringing things to the test of *what is written*; hence, also, his hostility to transcendentalism and mysticism in the field of religion. His Pegasus trod the dry, hard road of fact, and made no excursions into cloud-land. He takes an objective view of the ordinances; he finds a meaning and a use for all of them; he has too much balance of mind, too much culture, too much spirituality to permit Christianity in his hands to degenerate into legalism; he shuns both sacramentarianism and mysticism. Nevertheless, compared with the current systems, his theology was objective, rather than subjective. It may be said, Mr. Campbell's clear, tangible, consistent view of the Christian system was owing to the native qualities of his mind. This is true in a measure, but not to the exclusion of Locke's influence upon his mind. How different things might have been, if only Mr. Campbell's mind had been early filled with old-fashioned metaphysics! Nor should I omit to mention that the visible success of his own work was largely due to his matter-of-fact qualities and Lockeian training. His presentation of the Gospel was bold, objective, clear. He drew the attention, especially, of men who had been bewildered by metaphysical theology. He pointed them to definite propositions to be heard and accepted, and to definite commands to be obeyed. Naturally, he drew around him co-laborers possessing qualities like his own. Men went forth to preach THE WORD. The formula, "The Bible means what it says, and says what it means"—from one point of view, a noble battle-cry; from another, a miserable shibboleth—rang through the land. In this generation, the abler men who continue Mr. Campbell's work, as a class, are not Lockeians; but there is small reason to think his formulation of the elements of the Gospel will be departed from. Some good results of the Lockeian habit of mind have been mentioned; there is no need now to speak of those that are evil.

III. A WORD OF CAUTION IN CONCLUSION.

The preacher must not often carry his philosophy into the pulpit; that is the place for the Gospel. For the most part, he must confine his metaphysics to the study. When we come to the table, we desire bread and meat, not some receipts for cooking, and a parcel of baking, roasting, and broiling machinery. Hungry souls come to the house of God for the bread of life, not to view the tools with which the preacher prepares his sermons. Processes are not commonly to be exhibited in public, and tools still less frequently. Results are what the people want. I have said the preacher needs a theology; not, however, to take the place of the Gospel. Constant theological preaching is not profitable. His theology is to be a sort of syllabus of his Biblical studies as illuminated by other sources of knowledge, a key that opens to him the analogy of the faith. In my own ministrations, I seek to be guided by this principle: Always preach according to a theology, but not often a theology; according to a theory, but not often a theory. Accordingly, the preacher is not to prove to men that they have souls; he is to assume it, as Christ did, and preach to them as such. He is not to dispute about conscience and the will, but to preach to men as having both these attributes. He will present truth in a given order, but not spend much time to show that this is the true order. Sometimes he must depart from this rule; occasionally an unsound theology will stand in his way, and must be removed. Often, however, a simple and practical preaching of the Gospel will do more to remove such an obstacle than theological disputation. But there are times when theology must be preached, when the Gospel preached according to a theology will not suffice. So it may sometimes become necessary to correct errors in philosophy, since they prevent the progress of truth. The materialism now so current in both mental and moral science is deadening in its influence on religion. It may be necessary to attack it as philosophical materialism, and to hold up a more spiritual philosophy. No rules can be given to decide such cases; nothing but wisdom in the preacher can determine them. But, as a rule, I adhere to the formula—philosophy for the study, the Gospel for the pulpit. Make no parade of logical and critical implements. Keep tools out of sight, but use the tools all the time for the promotion of culture

and the interpretation and systematizing of Scripture. The wise teacher keeps his science of education, his pedagogics, out of the school-room; he needs them, however, and uses them constantly in their place. By following the same method, the preacher will more and more learn what is in man, and grow in the efficiency of his work.

II.—UNCONSCIOUS ENEMIES OF CHRISTIANITY.

IT is Christianity or nothing. All false religions go down before the march of modern civilization. No enlightened man can worship either Isis or Osiris, Jupiter or Woden, Brahma or Vishnu. The world is saved from the superstitions and cruelties of idolatry. Excepting Christianity, there remains only what science may do. But science, whether we consider its adaptation to such a work, or the irreligious bias of its devotees, gives little promise of any thing reliable. If soul and body rot together in the grave, there is nothing to be said, and science is dumb; if the soul is immortal, science can not demonstrate it, much less declare the duties we owe to this immortality. Had science any tendencies in this direction, yet would it be inadequate; its progress is slow, retrograde at times, and its results uncertain. *Æons* would pass away before this coral-reef could rise above the ocean of ignorance and superstition; *æons* more, before it would be habitable by a majority of our race. Just now, God and eternity are declared to be needless hypotheses; or, if realized at all, they are to be classed with the unknowable. Men, who have thought their way through this subject, will tell you calmly, perhaps sadly, that this one alternative at last confronts them—Christianity or nothing. Said the writer to a skeptical lawyer, "Since you reject Christianity, what other trust have you?" "None, absolutely none!" was the reply. This, at least, is severely logical; for when one has condemned all the evidence for Christ as utterly worthless—history, prophecy, reason, nature, and experience—he has thrown down the pillars of all religious faith whatsoever. There is nothing left whereon nor wherewith to build a new faith. In pro-

portion as other systems disappear in the receding darkness, Christianity rises into the clear light of day. If the war slackens about heathen altars, it is growing fiercer about the cross. Christianity is discussed by the fireside and the wayside. It is the theme of the pulpit, the rostrum, and the press. The cross hangs in every sky, and the nations can but gaze. Momentous questions these! Have we light, or is it the midnight of eternal darkness? Is the coffin the only house prepared for the soul, or is there a life beyond? Is it divine forgiveness, or everlasting guilt?

The world-wide conflict thus introduced to us is an intellectual and a moral one. It can not be decided by sacrificing the wealth of Christendom, nor by the meeting of infidel and Christian armies. We expect no great discoveries nor decisive experiments. We await no angel's coming to trouble the waters. We ask not for sign and miracle. We sleep, not hoping for dreams and revelations. The prophets are in their sepulchers, and the heavens have received the ascending Christ. On the field we now occupy, and with the weapons now in our hands, we must fight this battle. It is a contest between the intelligence and moral power of the Church on the one side, and the intelligence and skill of all the world besides on the other. Shall Christian logicians so work out the problem, and so spread before the world the clear solution, as to satisfy every candid mind and silence every objector? or shall the skeptical world show the most learning, research, and dialectic skill, and, though we have the truth, shall they have the victory?

If, turning the pages of history, and surveying the present condition and attitude of the hostile forces, we shall ask how this great intellectual conflict is going, we shall find many things to cheer us. The nominal Christian population of the globe is more than four hundred millions, and these comprise the wealth, the learning, and the civilization of the age. There is a high degree of missionary zeal. A large percentage of the world's wealth is devoted to intellectual and moral culture. The Sunday-school movement promises much. As the battle sways from the old ground to the new, the issues become fewer and grander. Religion is less a matter of miracle, and more a subject of law and science. The sword of the Inquisitor is sheathed, and national barriers are broken down. False religions and philosophies are waxing old and ready to vanish

away. Even the concentration of infidel forces and the boldness of their attacks are auguries of good, for we shall find the enemy and know where to strike. Still, with all these evidences of progress, we cry in our impatience, "How long, O Lord, how long!" Why are so many millions unsaved? Why do so many reject this religion? It is from God, and the evidence most abundant and unanswerable. Why, then, can not all conscientious, thinking men be made to see it?

In answer to this question, it is evident that, while much is owing to non-investigation, and more to that moral grossness which makes men unwilling to believe because unwilling to obey, still by far the most prolific source of unbelief is the *misrepresentation* of Christianity. This is the Northern hive, whence swarm the Goths and Vandals of infidelity. They do not see Christianity as it is, but only some horrid caricature. The light in which they see even this is subject to double refraction, coming as it does through the dense media of false training and moral prejudice. Is the Roman hierarchy the reign of heaven? Is Protestantism, mangled and bleeding, the body of Christ? Is a Calvinistic creed the Bible doctrine of liberty? Does a Methodist camp-meeting present Scriptural examples of conversion to Christ? "If this is religion," says the objector, "then I want none of it." We have an example of this reasoning in Draper's "Conflict between Religion and Science." In this work the Roman Catholic Church is "religion," and the better teachings of philosophers, "science." When he has twisted these perversions in opposite directions, of course there is a "conflict." Though this is the old logic of comparing a rough saint with a smooth sinner, yet it illustrates how misrepresentations of Christianity are the chief sources of unbelief.

The unconscious enemies of Christianity are the authors of these perversions. I call them *enemies*, because they are not only corrupting the Church, but also giving the unbelieving world its most destructive weapons; and, *unconscious* enemies, because they are doing this in entire ignorance of their hostility to religion, but rather with the pious intention of defending and propagating the faith. There were such in the olden time. When Uzzah, in his over-zeal, stayed the tottering ark of God, he delayed its triumphant bringing into Jerusalem by twenty years. When Peter would dissuade Jesus from going up to Jerusalem to be condemned and crucified, he was an

unconscious enemy of Christ, and heard the rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan." In all the progress of the Church such enemies have existed, and they are exceedingly numerous and dangerous in modern times. It is a sad fact that one may be dangerous to a cause for the triumph of which he would gladly lay down his life. How frequent and fervent should be the prayer, "Cleanse thou me from secret faults!" It is a sadder fact that the great source of unbelief is the innocent enmity of the Church. Its divisions, its multitudinous and absurd creeds; its mistaken zeal; its feeble arguments; its monkish seclusion; its persecuting spirit; its unholy, because overdrawn, sanctity; and its senseless opposition to reason and science, are but too many proofs of this enmity. Our needle-guns are more dangerous to friends than to enemies. Our cannon explode more destructively on this side than our shells on that. Not the gates of Hades, but ourselves we need to fear. Profoundly convinced of this fact, and believing that every Christian desires to be not only the professed, but also the real friend of Christ, the following pages are devoted to this discussion of the unconscious enemies of Christianity.

I. The first mention shall be of those who pledge the Bible, as a book, to an *unscriptural perfection and comprehensiveness*. Let Christian scholars claim constantly for the Bible an unwarranted perfection, and extend its scepter over provinces of thought where it asserts no jurisdiction; and then let the unbeliever show that these claims are unsupported, and that this extension of authority is a usurpation, and the argument is complete. Unconsciously, the Christian vies with the infidel in destroying his own religion. Now, the great body of the Church, and not a few prominent writers, are doing a work of this kind. On the one hand, they claim that the Bible is all, and in the highest sense, the word of God; that the holy men of old, through whom it was given, were mere automata; and that the volume thus given has been miraculously preserved in all its original purity. They practically claim for it absolute authority, not only in religion, where it is admitted to be supreme, but also in geography, history, chronology, medicine, literature, social law, and natural science. It is set forth not only as a book of principles, but also as one of specific commands, intended to regulate, in all ages of the world, the minutest concerns of individual life. On the other hand, it will be shown that

the Bible contains the words of men and angels, good and bad, as well as of God ; that the writers drew on their own sources of knowledge, had a style of their own, and wrote in harmony with the then state of human knowledge ; that the text of Scripture has come down to us borne by the natural currents of literature, and not without many an interpolation and corruption ; and that it was given to men of other times and states of civilization, and needs a wise discrimination and application to this remote age. It will be shown that, as a treatise on geography, history, medicine, government, and many other human sciences, it is a failure.

Nothing could be more disastrous to Christianity than these false notions among the masses— notions destined to be taken away, and with them the Bible itself. The remedy is not to be found in a dogmatic and blind defense of these pseudo claims. Nothing will serve Christianity but the truth. A true position alone can be defended. Our views of inspiration must harmonize with the facts, and not exclude them. We must show that the extension of the Bible beyond the province of religion is an abuse. Admitting the human transmission of the Scriptures, we must show that various readings and interpolations do not touch any essential fact or doctrine. We need maintain only that the Bible "is able to make us wise unto *salvation*." We need not barricade the progress of the age with Bibles, unless a sound exegesis shall lay upon us the command.

II. A second class represent Christianity as something *wholly apart from reason and science*. In many a sermon, reason is denounced as weak, corrupt, and presumptuous. Reason and faith are held up in contrast ; the one to be condemned and scouted, the other to be trusted and extolled. Every thing is to be taken on authority. To ask the reason why is an unpardonable sin. Clergymen are sent to cram their dogmas down our throats, however our moral stomachs may loathe and reject them. Reason must do homage to religious dogmatism. The less reason, the better Christian. The less reasoning in the pulpit, the better preaching. "Reason and Religion" is the subject of any amount of pious and learned nonsense. From the sacred desk and in religious periodicals, science is often the subject of disparagement and ridicule. Much that is false, and some things that are true, are said about the limited vision, the inadequacy, and

the hypothetic and shifting nature of science. As in politics and religion, so in science and religion, there is a desire to have them served on separate plates. We tolerate a science of mind and of morals, but what Church would hear any thing about the science of religion? Here, as before, Christians and unbelievers are working together to build up an argument against religion. It is clear that if Christianity is against reason and science, it is not from God. When the preacher decries reason and science, the infidel says, 'So I thought, and so I have been constantly affirming; it is unreasonable, and must go down under the stunning blows of science.' These tirades against science are only widening the breach, and causing multitudes of earnest men to turn away in disgust.

Rightly considered, what have reason and science to do with religion? Much every way. The term *reason* is used in three different senses: to denote the intuitive faculty, when it is called "the reason;" to denote the ratiocinative faculty, or that mental activity by which we deduce conclusions from admitted premises; and to designate man's whole mental nature as distinguished from instinct. Now, in whatever sense used, reason is indispensable in religion. Without reason, in the first sense, there could be no conscience, no idea of right and wrong, no perception of obligation to do right, and no condemnation if we do wrong. Without the reason, man would not be a religious being; for conscience must go with us into all religious duties, and we are to seek constantly to have consciences void of offense toward men and toward God. Without reason in the last two senses, religion is equally impossible. How can one incapable of seeing the relation between proposition and proof believe in Christ? How could he be held accountable? Reason is the faculty to which God appeals. It is the only avenue through which a revelation can reach us. It must decide whether a professed revelation is really such. And how does the preacher reach the conclusion that reason has little to do with religion, except by delivering a sermon on the subject, except by reasoning about it; but if reason is invalid when employed about religion, then his sermon, or reasoning on the subject, is equally invalid.

It is not the province of reason to manufacture premises. "What can we reason but from what we know." Both nature and revelation furnish us the great facts from which we reason concerning them

Nor can reason reach beyond the premises ; it only serves to analyze and bring out what is implied in them. The idea of a revelation, indeed, implies the inability of reason to discover the things revealed. And yet we are not asked to believe any thing unreasonable ; nor would it be possible, if we were. To believe that Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead is reasonable, because the proof is conclusive. It would be most unreasonable to reject such evidence. *How* Jesus performed this miracle we do not understand nor believe, but only the fact. And so, generally, what we believe is always that portion of the matter in hand which we understand. In this respect, religion stands with all other sciences. He who goes beyond reason is walking in darkness. If we obey the commands of Christ, it is not without reason ; we do it because he is divine and infallible. Instead of depreciating reason, would it not be better to urge the unbeliever to a more vigorous and well directed use of reason. It is not very manly, to say the least, to persuade our opponent to meet us unarmed of reason. Let us rather meet and conquer him with all his armor on.

Science, instead of being the enemy, is a co-worker and servant of religion. We should judge beforehand that these two departments would illuminate each other. They have the same author. All truth is harmonious. Separate systems of truth combine to form the one universe of science. The natural and the supernatural are but halves of the same sphere. Science is the methodical statement of God's thoughts, as embodied in natural forms. If Christianity presents the divine thoughts concerning us, it must be in the highest sense scientific. The crystal, the leaf, and the wing of the insect, are constructed under perfect laws. Science exhausts her technicalities and her formulas in explaining even man's physical nature. Mind is also subject to law. Now, if we find science in all the universe besides, and every force and process guided by immaculate law, how can we suppose that in the higher realm of religion the All-wise works fortuitously and without wisdom? Mental, moral, and social science are closely allied to religion. Religion appeals to the intellect, it purifies the moral nature, it regulates the family, and gives laws to the state ; it gives direction and impetus to every measure for the civilization of degraded races of men. Does religion seek to do this in contravention of these sciences, or in harmony with them? If the

latter, then, certainly, these sciences will justify and explain the methods and requirements of religion.

Nor does physical science refuse this service. It is occupied in discovering the plans, the thoughts, and the methods of the Divine Worker. If there be thought in nature, then there is an Infinite Thinker. However atheistic scientific men and theories may be, they are piling demonstration mountain high relative to the being and attributes of God. Natural science is removing all presumption against the immortality of the soul. Matter is found to be quite as subtle and unknowable in its essence as spirit. The indestructibility of matter, the conservation of force, the infinitude of beings below, as well as above, man, and their immense variety, are all parts of this argument.

We should welcome every sound argument for Christianity, from whatever source it comes; and certainly there is nothing more natural or more worthy of Christianity than that the works of God should corroborate his word. If the preacher can show that nature coincides with revelation relative to the natural attributes of the deity; if he can illustrate from history, what the Bible declares, that all have sinned; if he shall show that there underlie the atonement the profoundest principles of government; if he shall point out the adaptation of the Gospel to change the heart and life; or if he shall show the reasonableness of the awards annexed to the divine commands—who can object, or upon what grounds? This would not underrate nor weaken other proofs. It is not an admission that the older evidences are inadequate. There are also other reasons for this method of treatment. A large and growing class are accustomed to this method, who are not skilled in weighing historic proofs. Scientific books, periodicals, and communities are greatly multiplied. Illustrations drawn from science are generally understood. How greatly it expands the horizon to see that Christianity is in perfect accord with every natural and spiritual law! How it exalts our religion to a companionship with the very stars, to show that He who spoke by prophet and apostle, in the olden time, is the same Almighty One who spoke worlds into being and flooded them with life and light. Churches are not ruined by this broad, Christian culture, as some suppose. It is rather those who move in narrow, sectarian grooves, who are mainly bent on teaching how to spell and pronounce

the party shibboleth, and who are ever acting the religious demagogue, that ruin the Churches. If this be the true relation of science and Christianity, what shall we say of those theological schools which are confined to endless genealogies and disputes about words? Of the two, would it not be better for the ministerial candidate to seek first a thorough literary and scientific education and then trust the pressure and opportunities of his profession for Biblical training? or, rather, would it not be *best* to unite both in a broad and thorough culture of both science and theology?

III. A third class consists of *those who pledge the Bible to false science*. Here the professed friends of Christianity unite with its avowed enemies to build an adverse argument. Who so competent to interpret the Bible as life-long theologians? and who so worthy of confidence as men eminent in science? Now, if these shall place the Bible and science in diametric antagonism, how can this result otherwise than disastrously to the Church? Doctors of divinity, from their pulpits, may decry science, and vigorously apply the Scriptural epithet of "science falsely so-called;" but the great world, swayed as it is by an irreligious bias, will desert the theologians and follow the savants. This antagonism, of course, is wholly chargeable to vicious interpretation, since the word and the works of God are in perfect accord. That human science is progressive and that this progress implies a continual recasting of present theories, scientific men themselves will freely admit; but it is also true that not a few Christian scholars are persistently and blindly pledging the Bible to false science. This was done in former ages, as witness the efforts to array the Bible against the progress of geography, and the opposition of the Roman Church to the Copernican system of astronomy. "Does not," said they, "the Bible speak of the ends of the earth? Did not the sun stand still in the valley of Ajalon, and the shadow go back on the dial of Ahaz? Does not the sun come forth as a bridegroom from his chamber, and rejoice as a strong man to run a race?" It is not only possible, but quite certain, that this folly is being repeated in this enlightened age.

There is a large class who understand the Bible as maintaining the following theses:

- I. The universe is not more than six thousand years old.

2. God spoke the world into existence in a sort of magniloquent Miltonic way.

3. God's days are like man's, and only twenty-four hours long.

4. There was no death in the world till Adam sinned.

5. It did not rain till the time of the Flood, and there was no rainbow till then.

6. The Deluge was universal to our globe, and the animal kingdom was collected, crowded into the ark, kept alive, and distributed again, all by miracle.

The design and limits of this paper forbid any discussion of the merits of these questions. This, however, may be said. The believer in the Bible who affirms these propositions enters upon a gratuitous work. He is not compelled to their maintenance. He need not pledge the Bible to doubtful, not to say false, science. The sacred writer does not date that "beginning" when God created the heavens, and the earth. *How* God made the world, he does not say. Science, without fear of excommunication, may discover this if she can. The word day, in the first chapter of Genesis, does not of necessity mean twenty-four hours. When it is said this is its plain literal meaning, we have a bold *petitio principii*. In this chapter and the first of the next, as Professor Dana has shown, Moses uses the word in no less than five different senses. Green, in his excellent Hebrew grammar, shows that this word has great breadth of meaning. The first day, with its long primeval night; the third, when the continents were elevated and the seas formed; the sixth, when man performed so much work and had such varied experiences; and the seventh, lasting till the present time as God's Sabbath relative to this world, were evidently long periods. Very probably the other days were like them. Could the twenty-four hour interpretation be fixed upon the word, what would be gained? Nothing whatever, and much would be lost. Granting the larger meaning, the order of creation, as given by Moses, is corroborated by every science competent to testify. Why sacrifice, without necessity, so powerful an argument for the inspiration of the first utterances of the Bible? The penalty of death was annexed to human sin, and there is no need to interpret this as being more extensive than the crime. Why so construe the Scriptures, and that without necessity, as to call the ancient generations of plants and animals from their graves to testify against them? The account of

the Deluge is susceptible of a better construction, than that which makes it universal. Why, then, make it more extensive than the race to be destroyed? Why submerge the entire globe to purge the earth of a few tribes in Western Asia? for it is not at all probable that the race spread far over the earth till after the dispersion from the plains of Shinar. If the Scriptures themselves give us sea-room, why run into the straits or cling to the rock-bound coast?

Generally, those who dogmatize the most are least entitled to a hearing. The ease and self-assurance with which some preachers declare what the Bible *must* mean, and their off-hand relegation of scientific theories, facts, and authorities to the shades of uncertainty, would be simply ridiculous, if it were not so harmful to the cause of Christianity. It is even more pitiful when men who have spent their whole lives in scientific pursuits, who have narrowed their minds down to the study of some particular monad, or who have nearly gone crazy over protoplasm, shall assume to pronounce on historical evidence and religious doctrines. Such charlatanism brings both science and religion into disrepute.

IV. *Those who hold unreasonable doctrines and seek to fasten them upon the Bible* constitute a fourth class. By *unreasonable doctrines* is not meant, in this connection, doctrines about which reason says nothing, and which are above reason. Of course, such doctrines can be known only by revelation, and reason has only to say whether the professed revelation is of divine authority or not. This reference is rather to doctrines which are inconsistent with the admitted intuitions and deductions of reason. Infidels endeavor to load down Christianity with the religious wars and persecutions involved in its history; with Church quarrels and divisions, with the weaknesses and immoralities of its advocates. With these infidels many good and great men unite, when to this already crushing burden they add tons of unreasonable and absurd dogmas.

Among illustrative examples, Calvinism is entitled to take the lead. It never saved a soul; for salvation is through faith in Christ and obedience to him. Myriads have stumbled over it into hell. It is concentrated fatalism. From eternity the Unchangeable One elects and reprobates. This election is made sure by a partial atonement; for Christ, according to this doctrine, died only for the elect. To make

this fatality doubly fatal, men are totally depraved, and are only capable of doing evil, and that continually. Lest this depravity should, by some mischance, prove ineffectual, Calvinism makes sure that none shall believe and be saved without the "effectual call." Still further, the Almighty's hand is on those who are called, and however they may wander and resist, they are bound to persevere and be saved. This election was determined by no merit in the saved, nor by any foresight that they would believe in Christ, but solely by the arbitrary will of God. This untrue and degrading view of human nature, this blasphemy against the character of God, this theological system having so much more damnation in it than salvation—these, if any things, are condemned of reason as moral absurdities. The wonder that so many generations should commit the keeping of their souls to such a system is only second to the greater wonder that so many good and learned men can subscribe to a creed which they no longer believe nor preach. And yet there is a true doctrine of election. God, at various times, elected men and nations to carry out his plans, though not to eternal life. He has elected character rather than persons. It is an election through belief of the truth and sanctification of the Spirit—an election in which the soul itself gives the casting vote. Calvinism is sustained by obscure passages, and far-fetched metaphysical inferences. As a system of human speculations, it is but cobwebs, compared with the universal commands, promises, and whosoever-wills of the Divine Word.

Equally absurd is that tenet of Arminianism which teaches that a person can not understand and obey the Gospel till he has become the subject of miraculous converting-power. It makes little difference whether the election and reprobation were an eternity ago, or in this life. In either case the doomed soul has no alternative. In either case God is represented as refusing men the power to believe, and then condemning them for not believing.

Another example is the claim of sanctification, in the sense that one can reach such a state of perfection that he no longer commits sin. If by attending a so-called "holiness-camp-meeting," or by importunate prayer, one could rise to such serene heights, it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished; especially would it be a good thing if some of our public men could graduate in this school before their election to office. That sinlessness is to be approximated by

feeling, rather than by learning and doing ; that this quick and patent method is better than the old-fashioned way ; that we can surpass prophets and apostles, or reach such a stage that we shall need no advocate with God, are suppositions sufficiently daring ; and we have no need to face the Scripture declaration, that "if a man say he has no sin, he is a liar, and the truth is not in him."

Christian learning and piety have often been employed in giving the sanction of heaven to systems of immorality and oppression. The blessings of God have been invoked on the cruelest tyrannies. Scripture texts have been patched together by ingenious men to hide the deformities of states and institutions. Intemperance continues its ravages by the sufferance of professed Christians. The Church has the power to slay this monster at a single blow. If these unconscious enemies could make Christianity support oppression and crime, this success would be fatal to our religion. The moral purity of Christianity, like the sinlessness of its Founder, is the rock on which it is built. As the sun needs no proof that it hangs in mid heaven, but its own light and heat, so the moral purity of Bible teaching declares its divine origin.

Again, there are whole nations who maintain that Roman Catholicism is Christianity ; and it must be admitted that they are sincere in this. In proportion, however, as they shall succeed, will they undermine the religion they profess to love. Men of reading and thought can never believe that any pope, however wise and good, is God's vicegerent, is infallible in the interpretation of the Bible, or immaculate in the management of the Church. The nineteenth century can not brook the Romish confessional, which, in its very nature, is an invasion of the sanctity of home. The sale of indulgences, of masses for the dead, and of prayers for souls in purgatory, are but so many means by which the priest may hold his victim over the pit of hell, and threatens to drop him in, unless he pays handsomely. The horrors of the Inquisition, the impurity of its priests, and its grasping after political power, reveal its true character. History, reason, and science impeach it of high crimes and misdemeanors.

It is evident that all these advocates of error are enemies of true religion, however unconscious of this enmity and however pious they may be. And it is evident, furthermore, that Christianity must make slow progress while these things stand in its way.

V. Another class of unconscious enemies is composed of some of the most pious and zealous members of the Church—*those whose ideas of conversion, and methods of promoting it, are not in harmony with mental and moral science.* The prevalent and misnamed orthodox teaching concerning conversion, is, undoubtedly, the chief obstacle to the propagation of Christianity. In one view, it is a marvel that all do not accept this religion. Its demands are evidently right; for they are simply that we shall do the best for ourselves and our fellow-men. It enjoins the noblest life. In this world it brings to us the peace of God, and, in the world to come, life everlasting. It requires the renunciation of no real enjoyment, of no permanent good. The disappointments and sorrows of this life, our consciousness of guilt, and our fear to tread the lonely pathway of the grave, powerfully dissuade us from the rejection of this, our only hope. Against these pleadings within and without, pride of consistency, fear of man, and the love of sinful pleasure, could not prevail. If the earth repels and all the stars attract, how shall we not leave this blighted world and soar to the heavens? So it was in the ancient times. Three thousand accepted the first offer of mercy. Two thousand were the result of a second sermon. In less than three centuries the whole civilized world acknowledged the lordship of the Nazarene. Now, after months of preaching, we rejoice over a few scores or hundreds. The vast multitudes remain unmoved. There are various causes for this difference, but among them all the most potent hinderance is this popular but unreasonable and unscriptural view of conversion. A charge so grave as this requires careful statement and proof.

First, conversion is presented, not as a moral change to be brought about by moral means, and as something to be done by the moral agent, but as a spiritual change, to be wrought by divine and superhuman power. The teaching from ten thousand pulpits is, that faith, repentance, and a consequent change of life, are no part of conversion, but that above and beyond these we must have what is called a "change of heart," or the "new birth." This inward renewal is secured by an act of special mercy, and made known to the recipient by a special and peculiar experience. This experience is the passport into the Church, and often the only hope of heaven. *Secondly*, it is evident that, in order to secure such a conversion, two things must be done. The sinner must be induced to believe in Christ and

repent, as necessary conditions ; and then the believing penitent must unite with the Church in supplication for this divine grace, for this spiritual change. Both God and the sinner must be converted. After the preaching to sinners, there must be the praying to God. The first meeting is for sinners, but the second is for God ; and the latter is usually the longest, most earnest, and most uncertain. *Thirdly*, the evidence of this conversion is not the certainty of any divine promise, nor the compliance with any divine commands, but this experience rather. This is a brief but just statement of popular teaching and practice. There may be minor differences, but these are the prominent features.

The consequences of this teaching are most injurious. There is reason to doubt the validity of the professed experience. It can not be clearly defined ; and, in fact, no two are alike. One sees a light, and another dreams a dream. Some fall as dead, and others shout till they are hoarse. Mental excitement and anguish of soul prevent all calm observation and judgment ; and yet upon this change, life and death depend. How much of this experience is owing to joy consequent upon submission to God and to sympathy with the joy of our praying friends, and how much to this spiritual change, none can tell. Belief in its reality is exceedingly fluctuating. It depends on mental states. In times of despondency, when most needed, it vanishes away. A large portion of Christian people have a "standing doubt," where there ought to be the utmost certainty. Besides, if this change is real, why is it not relied upon as a continual miracle in proof of Christianity ?

It certainly would be miraculous, and as demonstrative as the raising of the dead. Instead of prophet, apostle, or argument, call in a score of witnesses, put them under oath, and let them testify. But this is never done, because Christians themselves have so little confidence in it. The overthrow of such a claim has a powerful recoil against religion itself. Another result is, that "getting religion" becomes an experiment, and few men like to subject themselves to such experiments, and that in a public manner. It is a trial, and often a failure. Many a penitent suppliant turns away from the anxious-seat a confirmed infidel. Few like to submit to the manipulations and whisperings of a certain class of revivalists and their fanatical helpers. This is all so different from every thing else, and

all so foreign to their methods of investigation and self-determination, as to prevent even a trial of this way. Further, this view represents God as being most capricious. Now he loves the world and gives his Son for it. He sends abroad the Gospel proclamation, inviting whosoever will to come and live; and yet he is so unwilling to hear and forgive that all this importunity is needed; nay, is often unavailing.

By this view, Churches are restricted and greatly hindered in their efforts to evangelize. Revivals are believed to come as special providences. The rain may fall on one country but not on another. There may be a work of grace at Pittsburg, but can not be at Cincinnati, unless God comes down the river. Most Churches sit, like Elijah on Mt. Carmel, with their heads bowed upon their knees, waiting till some sign shall appear. There is also, on this view, a wonderful misdirection of effort. If Churches would reason and plead with sinners as they do with God, the world would soon be converted. Not that it is wrong to pray for things God has promised, but we do not *truly* pray unless we work for the fulfillment of our prayers. This view of conversion leads to the wildest extravagance and fanaticism. Prayers are offered that the Holy Spirit may "just now" touch the hearts of distant friends and convert them; as if these friends would not have been converted long ago, if it depended solely on the divine will. Hammond revivals sweep over society like cyclones from the tropics, leaving only years of religious declension in their path.

The apostles advanced no theory of spiritual influence. They preached not the Holy Spirit, but Christ and him crucified. They plainly declared the conditions by an honest compliance with which every man might have the divine assurance of pardon. Such preaching now, as then, would commend itself to the reason and conscience of the most gifted and cultivated men, and also be level to the comprehension of the great mass of mankind.

VI. The last class to be considered is composed of *those who are devoted to the maintenance of denominationalism*. It is no more certain that these are unconscious of hostility to Christianity than that religious parties are injurious to the Church; both must be granted. The Savior established but one kingdom, and he prayed that all his

followers might be one as he and the Father were one, that the world might believe that God had sent him. Nothing would so hasten the day of millennial glory as the organic and spiritual union of all believers in Christ. Those who take the opposite position do so in disregard of the prayer of Christ, the purest aspirations of the Church for peace and universal fellowship, the results of union in ancient and modern times, and the deep conviction of nearly the whole Christian world. They are only exercising their ingenuity in defense of a bad case. Denominationalism not only distracts and discourages those who are seeking Christ, but it is also a powerful weapon in the hands of infidels.

Multitudes would abandon sectarianism and this unconscious hostility to Christ, if they could see any way out of the labyrinths of Protestant creeds and parties. This is undoubtedly a most difficult problem. It implies not only the opening of the prison doors and the great iron gate, but also unbinding the prisoners and inducing them to escape. It would be to this age what the Reformation under Luther was to the sixteenth century. Without claiming the solution of this problem, which perhaps is possible only to Divine Providence, a few suggestions only are offered.

1. Those who maintain denominationalism mistake the purpose of the Church. It was commissioned to publish the Gospel and help men in their struggle against sin. It does not receive men to doubtful disputations and the discussion of endless genealogies. It is not a convention for the adoption of a creed. It is not an Inquisition to try and burn heretics. It is not its province to keep an *index expurgatorius* of men as well as of books. But it is a home for those who would break off their sins by righteousness. Its sole business is to *help* those who are ready to perish. How sadly the Christian world has forgotten this! While the day is far spent, and uncounted millions are ready to perish, we are settling dogmas, measuring one another's relative soundness, and arranging the etiquette of worship! A man may be very ignorant, and consequently very unsound, and yet be a child of God. If we must all be "sound" in order to be saved, God have mercy on those who *think* they are sound.

2. Again, it may help us to consider that all truth is not equally important. There are truths which were all important to men of ancient times, but which have little to do with us. There are other

truths which will be important when we come to them. How evil came into existence is an interesting question, and also whether the soul is conscious between death and the resurrection or not; but they have little to do with the present time. Men *are* sinners, and it *is* appointed unto men once to die. The present truth is essential. How shall dying men be saved, is the great practical question. It is an ever-present truth that we should add to our faith courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. If we should erase from our creeds all dead and all unborn truths, they would become wondrously short and simple. Passing over a thousand questions whose discussion only serves, to divide, weaken, and delay, let us hasten to the rescue of the shipwrecked multitudes.

3. How far should we hold ourselves responsible for the religious views of other people? Before we set about the task of making all men see alike on every subject, it might be well to ask if this would be pleasing to the Lord. Has any man a right to thrust himself between another man's soul and his God? Is it not the right and the duty of every man to study the Bible for himself, as he must answer for himself before the judgment-seat of Christ? Who would assume the responsibility of another man's soundness in religious matters? Who, even if he had the power, would make all men believe as he does? It is our duty, indeed, to give all the light we can, and also to receive it from whatever source; but, further than this, how can we be responsible? And yet the great object of the struggling sects is the questionable privilege of regulating the beliefs of all others. In their over-self-confidence, they would make all others like themselves. Shall we disfellowship whole parties because they differ from us in matters not essential to salvation? Would such a course make matters better? Would it not be our duty, rather, to mingle with them and afford them light? Besides, our own eyes might be opened. If Baptists have light which Methodists need, and *vice versa*, how are they to illumine one another in total isolation? Difference of religious views is generally a reason for association, and not for Pharisaic separation.

4. Again, it might be useful to inquire what association with religious people implies an indorsement of their heresies. Do we indorse their errors when we go along the street with them? when we trade with them? when they become business partners? when we read their

books? when we hear their preaching? when we pray with them? when we work with them in helping on benevolent enterprises? If any or all of these acts imply an indorsement of all the views of associated persons, then who can be saved? We must needs go out of the world. All this demonstrates that the basis of union must be simple, and composed only of saving truth.

5. Finally, in our search for a plan of union, it would be well to ask if there is a Scriptural, a divine plan. What was the one truth to be believed in ancient times? What degree and kind of union prevailed then, and how was it secured? Particularly, how were Jews and Gentiles made one in Christ? This divine plan might be worth ten thousand of human invention.

Incomplete as this enumeration of the unconscious enemies of Christianity may be, it suffices to show two things: *First*, that the greatest hinderance to the progress of Christianity comes from the Church itself. Historical criticism, false science, and infidel ridicule, are nothing compared with this. These unconscious enemies are all the more to be dreaded because they are sincere and pious. Their complete removal requires ages of religious progress. It should lead to prayerful searchings of heart and life, to find and bring into judgment any lurking and unconscious enmity to Christ that may be there. *Secondly*, it shows the inherent power of Christianity. It can endure the mistakes of its friends as well as the attacks of its enemies. Notwithstanding both, it is marching on from conquering unto conquest.

III.—THE ESSENTIAL, THE IMPORTANT, AND THE INDIFFERENT.

THE evidences in support of the Christian religion become stronger by the lapse of time and the progress of knowledge, There may be no positive addition to the amount of this evidence, but there is continual increase of its force and effect. The fact that Christianity survives and makes progress, notwithstanding the abuses and dissensions which it suffers from within, and the assaults which it encounters from without, makes more and more clear and certain to the discerning mind its inherent vitality and essential divinity. It has stood the test of all manner of perversions and counterfeits; it has been forced to carry the burden of superstition and fanaticism; it has been loaded down with unscrupulous and selfish ecclesiasticism; its heavenly spirit and benign doctrine have been covered over with the grossest caricatures; but, in spite of all, it has lived and gone forward, and at last its true features have shone out through the mask of falsehood and delusion in all their pristine symmetry and beauty.

In like manner, the force of the instruments which, from time to time, its enemies have employed against it, has been neutralized, or else they have been captured, and converted into defensive and supporting weapons. This is signally exemplified in the bearing of natural science upon the question of miracles. The universal and uniform reign of law has been accepted as an established fact; and the idea of a supernatural intervention, which should modify the operation of law or act independently of it, has been regarded as absolutely incredible, because contrary to the settled and indisputable conclusions of science. Now, however, as knowledge advances, the thoughtful perceive that the laws of nature can not account for their own existence, nor for the origin of the matter on which they operate. Hence, by an inevitable necessity, science is compelled to base itself upon the miraculous, or else to rest its whole structure of law, of life, and of the matter which underlies them, upon the mist and mystery of the utterly unknown, which is both irrational and unscientific.

If, therefore, the material universe rests upon miracle; if life, with its varied forms and characteristics, which modifies in so many ways the matter of the universe, is traced to the same source, there is certainly nothing incredible or unreasonable in saying that a spiritual system, designed to propagate and develop spiritual life, should also rest upon miracle.

To be sure, this does not prove the miracles of Scripture, but it does take away the presumption which science was supposed to have raised against them, and by so much adds to the force of the positive testimony in their support.

It is deeply to be regretted that, while Christianity in its essence is thus coming forth with more and more strength as the years roll away, it should still be exhibited to the world as a thing of conflicting creeds and discordant sects. Perhaps it is not possible, in the present condition of society, to correct this injurious state of things; but certainly there ought to be wisdom enough among the professors and advocates of this religion to determine and agree upon its absolute essentials. Hitherto this has not been done.

It is of comparatively little moment that there should be discussion on questions, which, though they may be highly important, are still not vital. The proper understanding, classification, and location of such matters in the system, exhibit Christianity as the purer, the better, the more consistent. Error on these points is an evil, it may be a great evil, but still not necessarily a fatal evil. We do well to combat it with earnest force, and to substitute for it when possible the wholesome and beneficent truth which it has displaced. But there should be no controversy respecting those things which enter into the very constitution and life of Christianity; those which are the differentia of the system; which being present, Christianity is present, and being absent, Christianity is absent. I say there should be no controversy among Christians on these points, because the fact of their being in controversy tends to cast doubt upon the whole institution, and thus to weaken and impair its strength as an aggressive power. These things ought to be equally dear to every heart, and set forth and supported by the combined force of all Christian intelligence and affection.

And yet, while it is obviously true that there are and must be elements and parts of Christianity which are absolutely and univer-

sally essential to it—elements without which it could not and would not be—it is still the misfortune and the reproach of Christians that they have not been able to agree as to what these essentials are. Some would place in the list matters which are simply, though it may be very highly, important; others would elevate to this place matters which in themselves are indifferent; while some, on the other hand, would take out of this class elements which obviously belong to it.

The Churches have devoted a great deal of earnest thought to the subordinate questions. They are learned in matters of government, and can render reasons for Episcopal, for Presbyterian, and for Congregational forms; the *pros* and *cons* of ritual and non-ritual worship they have at their fingers' ends; and not only in matters of government and worship, but also in those of doctrine, particularly speculative doctrine, they are intelligent and ready. On these points, and such as these, they read and write and meditate. But the question that takes precedence of all others; that gives to them all their importance, be it much or little; that should demand consequently the first consideration, and be settled with gravest and most solemn care—this is dismissed with but slight notice, remanded as it were to some obscure corner; while the great partisan peculiarities and denominational differences are brought forward into the chief places, and honored with most respectful attention. Who gives any earnest thought or devotes any serious attention to the question, What constitutes a Christian? How a Christian should live, how he should worship, how he should be governed, how he may best promote the interest of his Church, are practically of no consequence, until it has first been determined how he is to *be* a Christian at all. And this, the leading, the all important, the absolutely essential question, is still awaiting solution and settlement.

Believing that the Scriptural answer to this question, and the universal agreement of Christians in that answer, is the one thing most urgently needed to promote the triumph of Christianity, the writer proposes to contribute something which he hopes will tend to lead the thoughts of earnest minds in the direction of this result. He does not for a moment flatter himself that his own conclusions will be accepted by all, or even by many, as satisfactory and final; but he does hope that the momentous interests involved will induce the

reader to weigh with candor what may be written, and to reject only where, in good conscience and fidelity to God and to man, he feels that he must.

In prosecuting this purpose the sacred Scriptures are to be regarded as the only source of authority. Preconceptions, preferences, traditional influences, and all reference to consequences, both personal and associational, are as much as possible to be laid aside, and the mind in perfect freedom is to approach the divine source of information with a hearty willingness to receive and adopt its communications. In the next place, it should be noted that the inquiry will be greatly simplified and abbreviated by considering that the absolute essentials of objective Christianity are those the reception of which makes a man a Christian. This is necessarily true, because he can not become a Christian, in any worthy sense of the term, without accepting Christianity in every part and element essential to its being; nor can he thus accept it without thereby becoming a Christian. Hence, putting these two preliminary points together, our inquiry is simply this, What, according to the Scriptures, must a man accept, that is, believe and do, in order that he may become a Christian?

THE ESSENTIAL.

The Protestant motto, "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants," is to be understood as indicating not what *is* the true religion, but what is the source from which it is to be learned. The Bible reveals it, but the thing revealed is not the thing revealing. It supports, upholds, elaborates, and develops it; but still the religion is one thing, and the teacher and defender of that religion another. The Philippian jailor had never seen a Bible—the few words of the Lord which he heard and received on that memorable night, made him a Christian. It is possible to conceive that he never enjoyed the benefit and blessing of additional instruction. And yet, if faithful to the light originally imparted to him, and the covenant into which he then entered, it is evident that he lived and died a Christian. Imperfect he certainly would have been in knowledge, graces, virtues—needing the nurture of the sacred lessons, and the comfort and strength of brotherly communion—but still a Christian. He had received Christ Jesus the Lord. His heart had bowed in loving allegiance to him, and his life had been devoted

in voluntary and unqualified submission to his authority. This was all. But this embraced every thing that was absolutely essential. Christ is the embodiment of his own redeeming system, the fountain of all its light and love, the source of all its messages of grace, and all its beneficent institutions and ordinances. To accept him, therefore, in the fullness of his nature and offices, as presented in the Gospel, is the one thing needful. It establishes a vital connection between the sinner and the Savior, the helpless and the Helper, the dying and Him who has the power over death; and hence Christianity in its essence can not necessarily be any thing more, nor possibly any thing less, than this.

If the matter could be left in the form of the above general statement, there would be no room for controversy. Every one would accept it as the obvious truth. That the man who sincerely and heartily embraces Christ, and gives himself to him, is a Christian; and that he who fails or refuses to do this, whatever else he may be and do, is not—is a proposition that admits of no question. But the matter can not be left here. The responsibilities of the Church to the world lying in darkness require her not only to preach the necessity of the acceptance of Christ, but also to tell men *how* he is to be accepted, and especially what is absolutely essential to such acceptance.

I suppose that no one would hesitate to say promptly, and without qualification or reserve, that Christ is to be accepted by faith. This is not only clearly taught in Scripture, it also follows of necessity from the nature of the case. If Christianity were a mere abstract system of precepts and doctrines, it might be different, because these could be received and complied with regardless of the authority of him who propounds them. But as it is in its essence the allegiance of the heart and the devotion of the life to a person, such allegiance and devotion can not be given without sincere and heartfelt faith in that person. A man may be relatively good or bad without this faith—as good as Cornelius, as bad as Saul of Tarsus—but in neither case is he a Christian. Christianity is not piety, nor alms-giving; not prayer and worship; all these, in various degrees of purity and impurity, may be found in every quarter of the world, and in every kind of religion—Jewish, Mohammedan, Pagan, Christian. Hence, when the Gospel feast was spread, the servants were to bring in all that

they found, both good and bad. The "good" still needed the atoning blood of Christ, the inspiration of his spotless life, the support and guidance of his divine authority, and the bad needed no more. In a word, they both alike needed to become Christians by accepting the Christ and enthroning him in their hearts. And this they could only do by faith. It is needless to quote Scriptures in support of this. It is the leading practical thought of the New Testament. We are justified by faith, sanctified by it, connected by it to the Source of forgiveness, of life and salvation; so that he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not shall not see life—"shall be damned."

One would have supposed that an element so essentially and transcendently important as this would have been studied with most scrupulous and anxious care, so as to be perfectly sure of including in the term "faith" all that necessarily and Scripturally belongs to it. Instead of which, men have sometimes played upon the word; contracted it to the smallest possible dimensions; emptied it of much of its necessary meaning, and actually substituted the term in place of its own contents and significance. The *word* faith is accepted instead of the *thing*—as if a trick of logic could save a soul.

Now, the Scriptural faith, through which such great and eternal blessings are promised, is not merely a blind trust that Christ will bestow these things upon us; but we are taught precisely *what* we are to believe concerning Christ, and in what character he is to be received. This is matter of revelation. It is taught by the Father in heaven. It is the subject of the Gospels, and to establish and confirm it was the object for which they were written. What we are to believe, therefore, is that Jesus is "the Christ, the Son of the living God." And we are to receive him *as* such, or we do not have faith. A mere intellectual assent to this proposition, a concession or even a feeling that it is true, is not sufficient. Our conviction must be so deep and earnest and heart-felt that it leads to an actual and practical acceptance of the Lord Jesus *in* the character and offices which make him the Christ. Wordy and windy *professions* of faith have no saving virtue. "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Those who reject his authority, practically deny, and therefore in their hearts deny, the Christhood of the Savior—the very thing which is essential in the Christian faith.

Hence, the Protestant dogma of "justification by faith *alone*" should be more carefully stated (and, indeed, it were better that the unscriptural phrase were entirely abandoned), lest it lead, as very often it does, to the false expectation of justification *by the mere act of believing*. For if men understand "faith alone" to exclude not simply the works of the law and of human merit, but also the practical recognition of the authority of Christ, manifested by a voluntary and unreserved submission to that authority, such is not faith in the Scriptural sense; and if men are justified by this, they are justified not *by* faith, but *without* faith.

In a word, the faith of the Gospel, the faith so essential to the acceptance of Christ and the blessings offered in him and through him, includes obedience to him as a part of itself. This truth not only follows necessarily from the nature of the formula of the faith, quoted above, but is also clearly taught by the apostle. For example, in Romans x, 16: "But they have not all obeyed the Gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" The "report" is evidently the good news, or Gospel, of Christ. Isaiah foretold that many would not *believe* it, and, in proof that this was fulfilled, the apostle points to the many who have not *obeyed* it. The necessary conclusion is, that true belief of the Gospel involves obedience to it. Otherwise we should have the absurdity of Christ accepted by faith, enthroned in the heart, welcomed, honored, loved, trusted, adored, at the same moment that he is repudiated and rejected.

But obedience is a life-work, a daily submission to the Master and consecration to his service. At what point in this obedient course may one claim to have accepted Christ, or to have become a Christian? Obedience being essential to the change, and obedience in its amplest meaning being the service of the whole life, we should expect that something less than perfect obedience would be recognized, and that something would be, therefore, prescribed, as an approved and acceptable *entrance* upon the life service.

Previous to the introduction into the Church of infant baptism, there was no confusion, hesitation, nor doubt upon this point. The plain and explicit declarations of the Savior, illustrated by the teaching and practice of the apostles, requiring believers to be baptized as the consummating and consecrating act of their conversion—as the

act of obedience which tested their faith in the Savior as the Christ, and brought them into covenant relations with him—these declarations were gladly and gratefully received as the answer of the Lord himself to man's most solemn question, "What must I do to be saved?"

No disaster which has overtaken the Church has been fraught with greater evil than that which substituted, for the divine ordinance of baptizing believers for the remission of sins, the human institution of infant baptism. It has confused the whole scheme; deprived believers of the test which the Master himself provided, and of the settled and certain assurance of acceptance and salvation which he was graciously pleased to append to that test; thus leaving men in the agony of doubt and uncertainty, or else forcing them, as it were, to rely upon excited feelings and fanatical transports instead of the Word of God.

As a natural consequence, distrust of the Word of the Lord has been the painful result, and men will gravely argue against the plainest, the most positive and explicit declarations of the Savior, while claiming to be justified by faith in him—as if they could believe in him, in any proper sense, while disbelieving his truth.

Under the most solemn circumstances, on an occasion forever hallowed and dear, when he was sending out his apostles on the express mission of propagating his religion by making men Christians, he distinctly, plainly, and formally tells them how this is to be done: "Preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." If this commission can be rejected, if its terms can be varied, if its provisions, either in whole or in part, can be set aside as non-essential, then Christianity is not an authoritative system, and faith in its Founder is mere emptiness and vanity. If we can repudiate this, we can repudiate all; and if we can repudiate all, we can repudiate him.

If, then, the Scriptures, and the great Source of light and love and life brought to view in the Scriptures, are to be regarded as authority, and trusted as the only competent teachers on the subject before us, we must conclude that,

1. There is no Christianity where Christ is not accepted.
2. He is not accepted where there is no Scriptural faith in him.
3. There is no Scriptural faith in him without obedience.

4. The first overt act of obedience, after the preparation of mind and heart, the command which stands in the fore-front of the system, and which, resting alone upon Christ's authority, is the test of faith and submission, is baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

It is clear, from the practice of the apostles, that they so understood the Christian religion. They preached Christ, led men by evidence to believe that he was the Christ, and then they immediately baptized them. Under their administration, men became Christians, not by faith alone, but, like the Corinthians, they heard, believed, and were baptized. It was so in the beginning of the Gospel, it continued so to the end of the period of inspiration; and hence if the question is to be settled by the only authority which Protestants can recognize—the Scriptures of truth—there can be no doubt that we have found the essentials of the Christian religion. *With* these, men were regarded as Christians; *without* them, they were not.

THE IMPORTANT.

It will require but a brief space in which to exhibit what is necessary to be shown under this head. Having seen that the whole Bible, and even the whole of the New Testament, is not involved in the process of *becoming* a Christian, we now reach the point where all of it has place. The larger part of the Bible serves to support, to illustrate, and to elaborate its absolutely essential truths. In some sense, therefore, every thing connected with Christianity is essential to it—if not to its being, to its well-being. But while some truths are designed to impart life, others are for nourishing and developing that life; some make us Christians; others make us better, wiser, stronger Christians. The former are absolutely, the latter relatively, essential. The former build us *on* the foundation, the latter build us *up* on it. These latter, therefore, to avoid confusion, are classed here as important. Hence we say that "all Scripture given by inspiration of God is"—not absolutely essential to individual salvation, but—"profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be *perfect*, thoroughly furnished for all good works." Hence the gradual process of growth in knowledge, and the infinitely varied adaptations of the Scriptures to the different classes and states of men.

Surely, it can not be necessary to do more than enunciate this general proposition. It is so obviously correct that no one will call it in question, while all will appreciate the importance of studying and learning the sacred Scriptures for the sake of their confirmatory facts, their helpful precepts, their stimulating examples, their encouragements, warnings, admonitions, and for the hopes and prospects which they set before the faithful, and for the light which they cast upon the darkness of present trials, and the solution they furnish of the problems of mysterious providences.

We may also include under the present head the numerous subordinate questions which from time to time agitate and divide religious society. Most of them are worthy of consideration even when viewed in the abstract, and a Christian will find comfort and satisfaction in reaching clear and trustworthy conclusions respecting them. The speculative doctrines of theologians, and their views and positions respecting recondite and obscure passages of Scripture, are of this class. The origin of evil, the effect of Adam's sin, the doctrine of election and predestination, of final perseverance or of possible lapse, the *modus* of spiritual operation, and the like, are questions which, positively speaking, it may not be very important to understand, but which it is sometimes immensely important not to misunderstand. When such speculative dogmas become the postulates of a system, and mold and color the institutions of Christ so as to affect and change the meaning of the Gospel, we are obliged, if they are pressed upon our consideration at all, either to reverse the process of their propounders and bring these speculations to the test of the Gospel, or else incur the danger of perverting and misunderstanding the very truth as it is in Jesus.

It is not necessary, for example, that we hold any philosophy of regeneration. The teaching of the Savior and the apostles sets forth the whole subject with perfect explicitness, so that we may know definitely and precisely what regeneration means and how it is to be effected. But when we see the entire orthodox community wedded to a theory of regeneration which sets aside this authoritative teaching, and actually trusting in this theory, preaching it, practicing it, relying upon it, and with indefatigable zeal propagating it, notwithstanding its direct antagonism to some of the vital essentials of Christianity, the importance of the question is at once apparent.

But this field is too extensive to be traversed in detail. I therefore leave it for the final subject of this paper.

THE INDIFFERENT.

In the associated life and work of Christians, or in the exhibition and perpetuation of Christianity as a living institution, questions arise about matters in themselves essentially indifferent, but which, nevertheless, may have a relative importance. These often grow into living issues, and if not wisely handled may become the nuclei of parties. They are easily understood and appreciated when viewed in the distance, as matters of history; but when present, with all the passing preferences and antagonisms to which they give birth, the greatest circumspection and wisdom are required in dealing with them. One party will always be inclined to attach them to the high class of essentials, while the opposite, recognizing their abstract indifference, will be in danger of *treating* them with indifference. But however trivial a matter may be, it acquires a sort of importance and becomes sometimes practically momentous by reason of the feelings and prejudices which are engendered by it.

There is nothing in which such a state of things is more likely to arise than in matters pertaining to public worship. These are left largely to the discretion, taste, and sense of propriety of the worshippers; and tastes and judgments are likely to be forever, as they have always been, various. One man will think an organ the best thing possible to improve and perfect the singing of a congregation. Another, disgusted with the time and tune of untaught singers, will oppose congregational singing altogether, and insist that the choir and organist should alone participate in this service. Another still regards the organ itself as an abomination, and insists that it must be ruled out or it will rule him out. His sense of propriety is averse to it, his feelings are aroused against it, and ten chances to one if he does not come to fancy that his conscience is involved in the matter, and that the introduction of an organ is a sin as of witchcraft. All parties search the Scriptures for authority *pro* and *con*; and finding none, as of course they do not—the matter not being the subject of Scripture teaching at all—they strain and force different texts into a sort of simulated support of their respective positions; while heart-burnings, uncharitable speeches, and all manner of evil thoughts,

grow and multiply, until they die at last a natural death, and some other folly springs up to be nourished by the same passions and pass through the same stages.

What is needed on this whole class of questions is the hearty recognition, without reserve or qualification, of the liberties and rights of others.

No man who has looked with philosophic care upon the present state of denominationalism can have failed to notice that parties aggregate largely upon the single point of taste. Nine-tenths of those who are Presbyterians are so, not because they appreciate the distinctive doctrines of that sect, or really care any thing about them, but because they like the Presbyterian way of doing things. Others, whose tastes, feelings, habits, and preferences are different, go to the Methodists, for a similar reason. Others of a different type still become Episcopalians. And so through the whole round. It is only the few who are actuated by considerations of doctrine and creed; for, whether true or false, it is beyond doubt that the prevailing opinion is that in these respects one Church is about as good as another. But aside from these, every man has his preference, and takes position as it leads him.

There is a profound philosophy underlying all this that the successful, the predominant, the true catholic Church of the future will be sure to recognize and act upon. It is the philosophy of not only tolerating, but of providing for, the various tastes and peculiar preferences of the respective classes of men on all these matters of indifference. Hold firmly, teach faithfully, and without any wavering or compromise, the essential truth. Make men Christians according to Christ's law, and develop and perfect their moral and spiritual nature by his Word and ordinances. Make them one in him—one in their deference to his authority and their honor for his Word—and in all things else leave them free. If they want an organ, let them have it. If they are averse to it, respect their preference. If they wish to conduct their worship like the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Episcopalians, the Lutherans, let them do so, not only without censure but with approbation.

But, alas, such is the weakness of human nature, and such the intolerance of the human heart, that we must have uniformity respecting all these secondary matters, even if it hazards the success of vital

truth. Men must accept our taste, be governed by our preference, worship in our mode, or have no place and no recognition among us.

For myself, I should prefer this spontaneous variety, on all these non-essential matters, to a stale, dry, dead uniformity. We seldom need two Churches just alike in the same town. And it would be a positive blessing if, when there are several, each should be composed of those who find there their own peculiar tastes provided for and their innocent preferences gratified. Thus without sects or denominations, with perfect concord and agreement in faith and doctrine, we should be able to reach all classes, and gather in and save from all quarters. Without this we shall address only a small fraction, and the multitudes will find among the diversities of denominations the satisfaction and comfort which we refused to afford them.

In cases where, from the sparseness of population or other causes, it is not possible to provide for all, the hearty recognition of the *principle* will lead in every instance to such compromises and adjustments as will be acceptable, because seen to be, under the circumstances, the best that can be done. The main point is to establish and honor the principle that unity of faith is consistent with diversity of opinion; and, moreover, that the freedom proclaimed for diversity of opinions is meaningless and delusive unless it extends to the practices dictated by those opinions.

IV.—ABOUT GOD AND CREATION.

WHO is God? What is God? Is there a God? God is an intellectual necessity; that is, the human mind is so constructed that it *must* believe in God. We are, in painful unrest till we rest in God. God is the inevitable goal of all true thinking. A thousand paths lead us to him. Every leaf, every star, lands us in him. Who made this grass-blade? Nature? How could that be? Has nature intelligence and volition? Is nature an agent? Is not nature rather simply the visible garment which at once hides and reveals the God who works through it? Who made the stars? Did each star make itself? How could it act before it *was*? Did one father star make all the others? But who made this father star? Itself? Every body says, No! It had no will; it was, therefore, itself but an effect; it was *caused*. If caused, then it was caused by a cause. But who caused this cause? Another cause? This does not help the matter. The Indian fable of the world resting upon an animal, and this animal upon another, and so on, is only an irony, and was never believed for a moment, even by a child. A cause that is not itself an effect—a first cause, a cause of all secondary causes—*this* is what we need; this is called for by all consecutive thought; to this we are intuitively and irresistibly driven by our very intellectual inability to think the contrary. If, therefore, *any* of our thoughts are true, this is true—that there is a First Cause. That is, if we know any thing at all, we know that there is a God. This is to the mind what Noah's ark was to the dove. We might try to rest upon the glittering waves of idealism or pantheism, but only for a moment; sure footing is found only in the ark of *God*.

But *what* is God? He is cause, and he is first. As *first* there was nothing before him, nor in fact any thing as early *as* he. For he was *before* all things; that is, all things *but* him were subsequent (logically at least) *to* him. But how about time and space? Time and space *are not* really at all. They are not things, but thoughts; they are not entities, but mere conceptions, mere forms of thought. They have not positive existence. But God *is* positive;

he exists; and 'before and above and beneath him, there was and is *nothing*. As first and as cause, God is uncaused cause; hence, he is independent. How and why he exists is incomprehensible; we are simply under a constitutional necessity of admitting that he does exist. This necessity, however, having been once yielded to, light, glory, and order stream thereupon over the universe. Now we can understand many things; before this we could understand nothing. As first cause, God is now known to be the primary cause of all that is *not* God. He is the Creator of all the substances and beings in the universe. We can not prove this, we can only *know* it; for it is more certain than any proof—resting upon that which is the ground of all proof; namely, our intuitions, and, more particularly, the intuition of cause and effect.

As *first* cause, God is the source of all the power and order and life of the universe. The magnitude of the universe calls for power in its Cause; its order calls for reason; its life calls for life. The "things seen" reveal the qualities of their Maker. God is, therefore, *potent* and *rational* and *living*. From our inability to think of God as limited or imperfect, we are forced to regard him as perfect and unlimited, at least from without. He is limited only from within; namely, by the very perfections of his being. Being perfect power, he can not be weakness; being perfect wisdom, he can not be unwise; being perfect harmony, he can not be disharmony. God "can not lie;" this is the sole sort of inability or imperfection that belongs to him. But this is no imperfection at all.

Reason and the Church express the scope of God's attributes by prefixing to them the word *all*; thus, God is (*all*-powerful) *omnipotent*, *omnipresent*, *omniscient*, etc. But what do we mean by this? We do not mean that he exerts all the power that is exerted; for we are conscious that he does *not*; *we* exert *some* power ourselves. We can only mean that he is adequate to all the exertions of power that are called for by his infinite wisdom.

What now do we mean by saying that God is omnipresent? Not that he is actually present at every point in space; for then he would *fill* all space, seeing that he is not an abstraction but a substantiality; then there would be no space left; and then pantheism would be true; for both we and the rocks and the stars occupy a part of space; for God is a positive entity, and we and the stars are

so also ; and two positive entities can not occupy the same point of space at the same time. All we can mean, therefore, by God's omnipresence is, that he is *potentially* present at every point of universal space ; that is, that he is *able* to be present wherever his infinite wisdom calls for his presence.

But what do we mean by God's omniscience? We can only mean that he knows all that is a possible object of knowledge. He knows all that *is*, and *as* it is. He knows all the past and all the present, and all that is causally involved in the present state of the universe. He knows all that is the truth ; the false he knows as false, the true as true. He knows things *as they are* ; for example, if my final moral destiny is as yet uncertain and unfixed, then he knows it *as* uncertain and undetermined. But does not this view subject God's knowledge to the limitations of time? Yes ; for it *is* so limited. God's knowledge is as really limited by time as ours. Before he created the world he knew that it did *not* exist ; after he had created it, he knew that it *did* exist. If God ever has a new thought, he then knows something which he did not know before ; otherwise it were not a new thought. God's knowledge is, therefore, constantly being modified and increased. Whenever a planet or a sparrow ceases to be, then the knowledge of it as an actuality passes out of the storehouse of God's knowledge of actualities. Whenever a new planet becomes a reality, then God's knowledge of realities is increased by so much. All of which amounts to this : God's knowledge is a knowledge of *truth*—it embraces the past *as* past, the present *as* actual, the future *as* contingent. But are not all the events and acts of the future locked up and involved in actually existing chains of causation? And if so, does not an exhaustive knowledge of the present embrace all that ever will be? Yes ; if they are so locked up. But they are *not* ; the intuition of creatural freedom denies it ; and intuition is demonstration. The true expression of God's omniscience is, therefore, this : God knows all that has been, all that is, and all that is *necessarily going to be*.

As being potent, God has a will ; for nothing has power but will, or that which has will. This will, as in union with omniscience, involves infinite practical reasonableness, or wisdom. The infinite wisdom guides the will ; the will actualizes the wisdom. Hence there results absolute self-consistency. This self-consistency is the one

mother-virtue of God, whereof all the other so-called moral virtues or attributes are simply special phases. What, for example, is God's holiness but his wholeness, his rounded completeness, that is, his self-consistency? What is his justness or his truthfulness but his fidelity to his promises? What is his righteousness but his treating his creatures according to the nature and relations which he gave to them? and what is all this but his self-consistency? What would unrighteousness in God be but his coming into conflict with his own nature, or with the nature with which he has gifted his creatures? The cardinal virtue of God is, therefore, self-consistency.

From this stand-point we are enabled at once to see the sole true ground of right. The ground of right is the nature of God, as expressing itself through his will. This is evident from the sufficiency of this ground, and from the inconceivability of any other ground. For what was there before God as a ground for right? Nothing. What is there now above God? Nothing. What was before all things? God. What is the source of all things? God. By what alone is God governed? By his own perfections. What, then, is the rule of God's will? This will itself, or, what amounts to the same thing, himself. What are the products of the outgoings of God's will? Creatures and the consequent relations of creatures. When creatures live true to their natures and relations, what do we call their conduct? Right. What is the ground of the natures and relations of creatures? The creative will of God. God is, therefore, right when he is true to himself; that is, when he is self-consistent; man is right when he is true to God.

But is God always true to himself; is God's creative will a sufficiently immutable ground of right? It is the most immutable thing in the universe; for it is the source of all the immutability that there is in it. But, for that matter, it *is* absolutely immutable—in the sense of absolute self-consistency. But how is this made to appear? It results from the very idea of God as the absolutely perfect one. God has perfect knowledge, perfect wisdom, perfect power. Having perfect knowledge, he never makes a mistake. Having perfect wisdom, he chooses always the best thing and the best course. Having perfect power, he always accomplishes what he plans. He can, therefore, never possibly have any ground for undoing what he has done, or for doing it otherwise than as he did, and does, do it; that is to

say, he can never contradict himself, never be other than self-consistent ; and this is the only immutability required, or even possible, in a perfect, rational personality. Hence, the creative will of God furnishes the highest immutability required in the ground or standard of right.

And this does not in the least preclude God's absolute freedom and liberty. God is absolutely immutable (in the sense of self-consistency), and yet absolutely free. He always does just what he chooses, and his choices are absolutely free ; and yet he never does wrong, and never *can* do wrong. If he could do wrong, then that wrong would cease to be wrong ; then right and wrong would no longer exist. All of which amounts to this: The thought of God's doing wrong is absurd, because a contradiction in terms. God is the source and measure of right ; how can the source of right be wrong? God's inability to do wrong is a perfection resulting from this very definition. To do wrong would be to contradict his previous self ; and self-contradiction implies imperfection ; but how could the Perfect One be imperfect? His very nature renders it impossible. This does not imply a limitation of his freedom, but, on the contrary, a perfection. His freedom is not a single sphere of his being, that may possibly conflict, for example, with his wisdom and truthfulness, but it is a trait of his entire nature. God *has* not freedom ; but God *is* free. His whole nature is *one* nature ; and the one trait of his nature is vital self-consistency.

Such is our conception of God. Is it correct? If not, wherein is it wrong? Every Christian, who is not dead, must study the subject, and ask and re-ask the question for himself ; for it is only in this way that he can be sure that his God, that is, his notion of God, is better and truer than the fetich of the Hottentot.

Having found who God is, we next come to creation, or the universe. But what is creation? All that has had a beginning. What is there which has not had a beginning? God only. God and creation are, therefore, all that *is* ; God being first, and creation second. But how do we know that creation is second? By the intuitive law of cause and effect. Under this law, consecutive thought forces us back until we rest in a cause which is first, and unitary, and adequate to the causation of all that *is* outside of this cause ; that is, it forces us to the assumption of God, and to the inference of creation by God. God, therefore, created the universe.

But what is it to create? It is to cause to be or to exist, that is, to have essence, entity, substantiality. The nearest analogon to creating, in human action, is to imagine. To imagine is to confer ideal existence. We construct an ideal castle in the clouds—perfect in proportion, matchless in beauty, something entirely new in the universe. But it does not exist; it has no substance; it is more fleeting than a shadow. So soon as we cease to hold it together by attentive thought, it falls away. God, in creating, does a like thing; he constructs a universe. But his structure is not a mere picture; it is a reality. It is not a subjective ideality projected into space; but it has objective reality. It does not need to be held together by God's attention, lest it fall away. It is not merely constructed in space, like the cloud-castle, but it *occupies* space. In man and his cloud-castle there is but one existence, that of the man himself. In God and his creation there are two existences; otherwise there would be naught but God. The universe, therefore, is not a mere thought *of* God, but a thing brought into being *by* God. It is a thing apart from, outside of, or distinct from, the substance of God; otherwise there would have been no creation—there would be only one pantheistic substance. There would then not be God *and* a universe; there only would be God and no universe, or a universe and no God. But thought, lighted by intuition, proves that there is God *and* a universe. The universe, then, has objective being. God has given it to have entity *in itself*. Once created, it has thereafter reality, in the same sense that God has reality. God *is*, and it *is*. Any other conception of the universe lands us into the infinite absurdity of pantheism.

But this conception being true, some popular expressions are seen at once to be self-contradictory and absurd. It is absurd to say that the universe continues to exist solely because God, by an incessant act of volition, continues to hold it in existence. Such a notion is contrary to the very idea of existence. To exist is to have substantiality. A substance, when once created, no more needs God's active volition to keep it in existence than does a house need the unsleeping volition of its builder to keep it from ceasing to be a house. So it is, also, with individual objects inside of the universe. Trees, men, angels, are not mere thoughts of God, but they are substantialities outside of God. They also have being within themselves. They also do not need to be held into being by an incessant volitional attention of God.

The contrary and more popular view may seem to be the more pious, but the very opposite is the case. It is in fact not only not pious, but it is (unconsciously, of course) pantheistic and blasphemous. It is pantheistic, for it denies reality to created objects. It is blasphemous, because it renders God the real author of sin. If a palsy-legged man can stab his friend only by virtue of my holding him upright, then, if I do so hold him, I am morally and civilly guilty of the stabbing myself. If a man or a devil can lust or hate only by virtue of God's actively holding him in existence at each consecutive moment of the sinning, then the sinning is also God's. In fact, it is exclusively God's; for such a notion of a creature's being incessantly held into existence utterly excludes any real existence of the creature at all. It really implies this, that not only each consecutive moment of the man's or the devil's existence is directly due to God, but also that each action and part of the action of the man or devil is directly an act of God; for on this hypothesis the creature has no basis, no prop within himself, whereon to give footing to his action. The footing is furnished by God. Let the footing cease to be momentarily furnished, and no lustful or otherwise devilish feeling or thought will ever be possible. Let me guide my son so long as he wants to go where he ought to go, and I am innocent; but let me guide him when he wants to go into crime, and I also am criminal. So, let God hold angels into being so long as they will to act righteously, and no moral objection is discoverable; but let him continue to hold them into being when they begin to will wickedly, and the rationality of his course is no longer apparent.

But this whole notion of holding into existence is exclusive of the very idea of existence. It is a self-contradictory and therefore an impossible thing. To exist is, by the very conception of the thing, to have being within itself. To need to be held into existence is equivalent to the scholastic absurdity of an incessant creation (*creatio continua*), or rather re-creation, of the universe; an absurdity I call it, for the reason that if the universe needs to be created at any one moment, then it was evidently *not* created the moment before; then, also, there is not *one* universe, but only an incessant series of successive, and hence non-identical, universes.

All of which contradictions and absurdities drive us back to our former position: that there are two existences—first, God; and, second,

the universe; the first having existence in himself *per se*, and the second having existence in itself by virtue of *having been* created.

But what, now, *is* the universe? It is the totality of all that *is* except God. It exists, and is unitary, but yet manifold. It has lower and also higher stages. The lower stages are *for* the higher; and yet each stage has a relative worth in itself. The mineral, the flower, the insect, the animal, are not without value *per se*, and yet they are chiefly *for man* as the crowning stage of the universe.

Some of these stages seem to be entirely passive (inorganic nature); some are vital; some are active; some are rationally active. What is God's relation to the universe in these successive stages? We do not fully know. His general relation is that of superintendent, governor, proprietor, modifier. This follows from the very notion of the universe as his created product. But is God the exclusive agent in any of these stages? Yes, if any of the stages are purely passive. In such cases he is both original creator and subsequent modifier. But is he the exclusive agent in unconscious organic life? Is the growing of plants simply the continuous action of God himself, or has he so constituted the realm of vegetation, that it now goes on of itself, except as God sees fit extraordinarily to intervene and modify it? The latter is perhaps the case, though the former view is thought by some to be the more devout. It is not so, however; the latter is both more devout and more worthy of God. Surely, we should not think much of a watch-maker whose watch needed that he should stand by it day and night, and make it go with his finger! A watch ought to go of itself; so also a vegetable kingdom.

But is God the exclusive agent in animals? Hardly. Animals are not purely passive—automatons. They have some degree of liberty. It is even a question as to whether they are not partially superior to a purely dynamic or mechanical action of motives.

But is God the exclusive agent in the realm of rational spirits? All consistently predestinationistic, deterministic, fatalistic systems of theology say, Yes! But all such systems make God the author of sin, and hence are absurd and blasphemous. God is, therefore, not the author of man's acts. He has given to man to have the power of action within himself. His share in man's acts is this: He endowed man with the ability of acting freely of himself; he furnishes, therefore, the instrument; man does the acts.

This discretional freedom of the creature is the acme of creation. In producing free spirits, God created images of himself. In the realm of passivity (crude matter, chemical laws, plants), God intervenes and modifies; by direct dynamic force; in the realm of moral freedom (man, angels), he intervenes and modifies, *through reason, by motives.*

Our notion, then, of creation is this: The universe is not a mere phantasm, shadow, or show. It is not a simple exhalation from the bosom of Brahm—not a fleeting wave of delusion over the infinite abyss of naught; it is a solid reality, the first law of whose essence is *persistence in existence*, until its Creator actively intervenes to annihilate it.

V.—THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

NOT long since, there appeared in one of our leading public journals an article on the above-named subject, assuming the negative of the question, and giving, perhaps, the strongest negation that modern infidelity has yet produced. In this paper I shall endeavor to follow the general drift of that article, in so far, at least, as relates to the specific objections stated; and because here I can not give the article itself, I will give its groundwork, by distinctly, and one by one, stating positions on which the argument is made to depend.

No more momentous question can be presented to the human mind than that involving the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. If he did arise, as alleged, nothing in his antecedent history will be found too miraculous for credence—nothing subsequent too strange for universal acceptance. If he did not arise, Christianity is a myth, the sooner the better banished from the world.

OBJECTION I.—DISCREPANCIES.

The first objection is the old, old story of discrepancies in the New Testament narrative concerning the resurrection. It will perhaps avail nothing to say, "This has been answered a thousand times;" it must still be answered again.

Let us attend somewhat particularly to this discrepancy question. What is a discrepancy, and to how much weight is it entitled in making up a verdict on any given question? A discrepancy is an appearance of a mistake in a given statement, when that statement is compared with another proposing, purporting, or claiming to embody the same facts. In order that a discrepancy may vitiate a statement or invalidate an argument, it must be shown that the parts of the statement wherein the discrepancy appears, are necessary to the main question; failing in this, the discrepancy can only cast doubt upon so much of the testimony of *one* witness as is affected by it; it can not affect the entire testimony of even the witness through whose testimony it appears, much less can it affect the testimony of all the witnesses. Suppose, however, all the witnesses are involved either in the same discrepancies, or, which would be stronger for the objector, suppose no two of them agreed precisely in any statement; yet it must be borne in mind that the general tenor of their statements is the same, else there could no discrepancies exist. We beg the reader to bear in mind that we are not now dealing with *contradictories* or *opposites*, but simply with discrepancies; and, in the nature of the case, therefore, there must be some sort of an agreement before discrepancies can appear. This brings us to the test question: Which has a fair preponderance—the discrepancies on the one hand, or the general tenor of the statements on the other? As the author of the article under review takes the liberty of appealing to the reader, in a general way, as to this question, so now do we; and this is our appeal: Concede all the force of objection that can be lodged against the New Testament account of the life of Christ, including his resurrection; select all the discrepancies that can possibly be made to appear; compare them with the great burthen of those narratives, the thousand points of contact where no discrepancies can possibly arise—and as the infidel is confident all will be “vagueness and haziness” to the “discerning reader,” so am I equally confident it will be clear and definite to the discerning reader.

In the foregoing, we have conceded nearly all the objector claims, in respect to the *existence* of these discrepancies. There is yet, however, an important feature to be considered. Many of these so-called discrepancies do not, in fact, exist; they are but “the creation of a morbidly excited fancy” on the part of those who often have reasons

for objecting to the truth of Christianity, which, in their arguments against it, are seldom or never disclosed. I hope this statement will not seem too severe, since the writer of the above quoted words logically bases the faith of all Christians upon "the morbidly excited fancy" of the early disciples of Christ—a compliment (?) that perhaps can not be more gracefully received than by suggesting that possibly these "honest, earnest infidels" are as likely to build their superstructure of unbelief upon a "morbidly excited fancy" as are Christians theirs for belief.

Having now considered the question of discrepancies from the objector's point of view, let us change the current of argument, and show that, in point of fact, discrepancies are all in favor instead of against the truth of the New Testament. Nothing is more commonly known in the department of civil jurisprudence than that testimony, given by different witnesses whose statements too closely resemble each other, is invalidated thereby. It looks like collusion; it casts suspicion of fraud, and really jeopardizes what might have otherwise been a good cause. Circumstantial evidence with a certain direct bearing upon the point at issue, and yet without any thing fixed and stereotyped, ever carries with it a strength and force that never can be reached by the more direct; this, it must be kept in mind, is when several witnesses are giving testimony; this becomes all the more palpable and forcible when it further transpires that the witnesses who testify so directly and positively are *interested* witnesses, have some special reason for desiring to carry their point, and are therefore likely to testify for that purpose.

If ever there was a case made up in the whole world, where impostors or liars, or deceivers of any sort, or even those of "morbidly excited fancy," had need to cling with a death-like grasp to unity and sameness in their statements and testimony, that case was made by those who concluded to cheat the world into the belief that Jesus Christ rose from the dead. That they failed utterly to make their case by way of such direct and uniform testimony as to admit of no question, the ceaseless criticisms of infidels is sufficient proof—proof, indeed, that no such attempt was made. There is but another horn to the dilemma: They attempted to make up their case by the simple statement of it, as it appeared to each, each viewing it from his own point, each bringing his own idiosyncrasies of character and

idioms of speech into his testimony; having done this, each threw his manuscript at the feet of the world, and challenged its criticism for all ages to come. To say this was the work of crafty and designing men is to strangle in the throat nine-tenths of all infidel objection, which, for any vitality, must rest upon the discrepancies of these statements. And to say it was the work of men of "morbidly excited fancy" is to give to such a "fancy" and to such men more power than ever before or since conceded to the best "fancy," or the greatest or grandest of men; for take the whole Christian religion as a mistake or a falsehood, and yet the most stupid of infidels are compelled to admit that no system ever produced such an effect upon the world, and no book has ever provoked the criticism or called forth both admiration and hatred equal to that little New Testament, the work of a few illiterate men of "morbidly excited fancy."

OBJECTION II.—"THOSE WONDERFUL FORTY DAYS."

We next turn our attention to the "forty days." Here our critic is very much astonished that so little of record appears as to what transpired during "those wonderful forty days;" and, further, that it was the duty of Christ to show himself before his enemies, as well as his friends—to appear before all Jerusalem, and thus to settle the question at once and forever as to his identity and divine character. One answer to this the objector anticipates, but fails entirely, as I conceive, to turn aside its force. It is, that Christ, who had performed many miracles before these same Jews—and among them the raising of the dead—could do no more, even if he should show *himself* alive after death; besides, the spirit, whether of this day or that, which would seek to blunt the force of argument by resting the main question on a "morbidly excited fancy," would make the same reply, which would run something like this: A certain man called Jesus has been crucified; yes, we know it. It is rumored he is alive again; we do not believe it. His friends say he is ready to show himself; bring him in, and we will see him. The so-called risen one is produced, when instantly it is declared, Not the man, sir—not the man! Away with him! away with him! we want no impositions here! Why not? The men who had seen all that Christ did before his death, and had still cried out, Away with him! Crucify him! crucify him! would not be likely to deal any less gently with him if he appeared

to them again. The more evident and forcible must this appear, when we remember that for just that very purpose, namely, to get rid of acknowledging his authority, had they put him to death. But, because, as stated, this argument has been anticipated, and, so far as infidelity can accomplish any thing with it, has accomplished it, let us consider the other reasons why Christ did not appear to the public during those forty days.

To give a full answer to this, and one that will be intelligible to all, will require some considerable care, together with a fair knowledge of what I will style the genius of Christ's religion. For the benefit of the general reader, as well as for the unbeliever, we will make some preparatory remarks.

First, let it be observed that Christ's mission was not directly to the world; had it been, of necessity he must have remained in the world to carry forward his work. I speak of his mission in person. On the contrary, the personal mission of Christ related exclusively to two things: the one to offer an acceptable sacrifice, whereby all pre-existing laws and ceremonies touching a sin-offering might be abolished, and God still be just in justifying the believer; and the other, to conquer death in the person of a man—or in human nature—and thereby make it possible for all men to escape the power of death. Considered absolutely *per se*, it mattered not whether Christ had any witnesses at all; the ends accomplished, *per se*, by his life and death, both in respect to human nature and divine law, would have been precisely the same if no human eye had seen him either before his death or after his resurrection. But as a potentiality is worthless until made available, and as even a divine law is inoperative until placed in the hands of a proper executive, so, in order to benefit man by the potentiality disclosed by the life and resurrection of Christ, and thereby give to the race the benefit of a law suited to that divine force, it became necessary for Christ to select and instruct, during his stay on earth, such persons as he desired to intrust with the work of laying before the world the possibilities he had opened to it. It was further necessary that they in turn should instruct the world as to the means of applying all the potentialities of his life, character, death, and resurrection—of applying them in such a way as to make them available in accomplishing for the world just what God had accomplished for Christ.

Secondly, observe the correctness of this position from the following considerations: (1) Christ made no effort while here to carry his mission into various parts of the world; (2) he did not command the preachers he chose at first to preach his name in all the world; (3) on the contrary, he strictly forbade them going to any but Jews—rejecting Samaritans as well as Gentiles; (4) he announced on special occasions, as to the Syrophœnician woman, that he was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; (5) he maintained that position until *after* his resurrection, when, for the first time, he said, Go into all the world; but this he said to others, he did not propose to do it himself.

With these preparations, we are ready to state the main argument: that the real mission of Christ to the world was accomplished by his life, death, and resurrection; and as the business of his apostles was only to take the work when and where he committed it to them, so was it only needful that he should select and qualify those apostles; and so was it only needful that he should manifest himself to them—sufficiently satisfy them of his identity, and give them the evidences of his resurrection. That he did this, is found, not in the fact of their “morbidly excited fancies,” for they had abandoned him on his arrest, denied him at his trial, viewed afar off at his crucifixion, and went back to their fishing after his death! Truly, not of very morbid fancies, nor easily excited, were such men. They, however, did rally again at his call, did hazard all, proclaiming him as the risen One, and sealed their testimony with their lives.

Again, it is no part of the divine system to perform works of supererogation. Even Mr. Darwin thinks that God, if there is a God, does not busy himself with successive creations, but, having established a general law, he leaves the production of the species to the legitimate workings of that law, and the individuals of those species to make the “struggle for life,” with only the assurance of “the survival of the fittest.” Our enemies will certainly not complain if we turn their own weapons against them, or, at least, if we use those they forge and put into our hands.

Here, then, is a law, a principle of operation, selected by divine wisdom, namely, that the divine character and attributes should be illustrated in union with the human; that chosen agents should proclaim this to the world; and that these agents should be man, and

not God. What was Christ doing, then, "those wonderful forty days?" Doing precisely what the Scriptures state: he was with those chosen agents, speaking to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God; he was giving them their final instructions for the work they were to perform.

Having now the question answered, let us see if there is any thing extraordinary or unwarranted in such a course of procedure. Before doing this, however, let us take some preparatory steps, which will perhaps enable us to see a little more clearly. Much of the difficulty in the way of the "honest, earnest infidel" has been placed before him, I am sorry to say, by the blunders of the Church; false interpretations, dogmatic creeds, the dicta of councils, these have largely contributed to the doubt and shadow which have been cast over the New Testament; the force of these statements will be seen when I proceed to say that the Church is responsible for so much talk about the "religion" of Christ. Christ did not come into the world to found a religion; he never used the word religion, that we know of. He came into the world to establish a government, or, rather, to re-establish one. At a very early period in the world's history, the nations of the earth revolted—rebelled against God their only rightful ruler, threw off his government, established one of their own, and appointed their own rulers. The last nation to do this was the Jewish. God protested, they persisted; God warned, they disregarded him, and, like the other nations, selected their king. From that day to this, God has been practically ignored and set aside by all the nations of the earth. True, the so-called Christian nations acknowledge him in a general way; but their rulers are very far from laying down their crowns and scepters at his feet, very far from abdicating in his favor. Just here begins the work of Christ—a work of reconstruction, of regeneration. He comes to call back man from his disobedience and rebellion to his allegiance to his Creator. To do this, he establishes, not a religion, a thing to be measured by a few happy feelings while living or dying, *but a GOVERNMENT*. He asks the world to swear allegiance to him as the viceroy of God; he takes the throne at the right hand of God because the genius of his government is to embrace both worlds. At the proper time, as previously shown, he sends out his ministers—ministers plenipotentiary—to invite the world to become his subjects, and at the same time an-

nounce by what means that can be accomplished. He appears after his resurrection only to these, for the reasons shown; and now we ask again, Was there any thing extraordinary or unwarrantable in such a course? The answer is apparent; there was not. On the contrary, it was just the course we should expect him to pursue when we have fully understood the measure and scope of the objects thereby to be accomplished. Let us take a parallel case. Our Government sends her ministers to all the courts of Europe. Sometimes these are ordinary, sometimes extraordinary. Suppose, now, England or Germany should refuse one of these ministers, the proper credentials having been presented, what would be done? Would our Congress go over and argue that point? Would our President appear in person to that recalcitrant court? Suppose that court should say, We do not believe you have any President, nor will we till we see him, what still would be done? The answer is quite apparent. Some words not differing very much from Christ's words concerning unbelievers would likely be used, and that government, if not "damned" forever in the eyes of ours, would be at least until it repented, and made due reparation for the insult offered. Shall, now, earthly governments excel in decorum the heavenly? Shall mortals be more just than God?

Suppose, however, it be objected that this is not a parallel case, inasmuch as the one is an earthly affair, and has to do with technical and legal civil government, while the other claims to be heavenly, and has to do with the souls of men. We reply, first, that we have already been at pains to guard against such an objection by showing that Christ came to establish a government, and not a religion; and that, secondly, therefore, he has virtually to do with the control of human action, and should be expected to pursue in the main such a course in the formation and execution of his law as would be approved by the best and most considerate judgment of mankind. If we add to this—what perhaps would be denied by the infidel, and yet that which seems well-nigh self-evident—that the best human governments themselves are the best because they most nearly approach the models of the divine, we shall not only have the groundwork for the parallelism I have named, but it might be extended to a dozen more of particulars where the governments of men, in their best forms, run parallel with, are similar to, in fact are copied from, the government of Christ. Once rid the world and the Church of the almost monstrous, and

certainly utterly groundless, notion that religion, so-called, is a whim or creature of the emotions, a something to feel happy over now and then, a thing tested mainly by a sensuous appeal, a thing to be "got" or "lost" or "revived" by the ordinary processes of "working up the feelings;" rid the world and the Church of all such groundless and unworthy notions; plant instead the true conceptions of Christ's purposes with the world and his clearly expressed mode of carrying them out—and infidelity will have lost the main spoke in its wheel, and the Bible will have been rid of the chief in importance, and almost all in number, of the objections that are now so assiduously urged against it. In a word, the chief diet of infidelity is found in the incongruities and contradictions of the various *theologies* of the day, by transferring their assumed truth to the Bible, and thenceforward holding the Bible, instead of the *theologies*, responsible for these differences.

We will give but one more argument concerning the work of the apostles. The forty-day question we have answered. We have in turn one to ask, as follows: If all be conceded that is claimed concerning the excited fancy of the apostles generally, what cause can we assign for finding the apostle Paul ultimately the chief of the apostles? Here is something of the historic argument which, it seems to me, utterly overthrows the entire objection under consideration.

First, it is claimed on the infidel side, and we are gravely informed, that "the great body of the most learned critics hold that Jesus was resurrected only in the minds of his disciples;" (who are these critics?) secondly, it is claimed that "his appearances were the creations of a morbidly excited fancy;" and, third, that Paul was the greatest of all the apostles. Now, I am curious to know how these statements correspond. There may be some force in the argument that men intensely prejudiced *in favor* of another may be led astray by their zeal, or may impute fanciful attributes to their hero. But what of Paul? He was not a disciple of Christ; his name is not even mentioned in connection with Christ's during his personal ministry; and, when first mentioned, he stands before us as one of the most zealous and unrelenting persecutors of those who were believing in that name.

What works so sudden and momentous a change? What transforms the mad zealot of a religion hallowed by centuries, and the most splendid traditions that ever gathered around any people on the earth,

at once into an equally bold proclaimer of the doctrine he labored to destroy? Was this imagination? Was this an excited fancy? Certainly, our interlocutor will say, there is the same claim of an "appearance," the same pretense that Christ "appeared" to Saul, as to the others. But, we reply, the cases are not similar; if any force can be drawn from this plea, it must be on the ground of friendship, of prejudice *in favor* of one, as already shown. To say that an openly avowed enemy of a given person can at once be transformed into a most determined friend, this only by an "appearance" of that person to the enemy, and that "appearance" a work only of a morbid fancy, is certainly quite a stride in the laws and principles of testimony, and infidels have but to establish the correctness of the principle, in order to obtain "letters patent" to the most wonderful discovery of this or any other age. Such doctrine would stultify all common sense, would overturn every received principle of evidence, would vitiate every law by which either the innocent could be acquitted or the guilty condemned, and, in the language of a learned writer, we would have "the most prodigious causes and the most insignificant effects," but "now the case is just reversed."

It need only be added that the whole life of Paul, the history he created, the circumstances under which he became the chief figure in the foreground of the picture, the influences of his doctrine upon the world, reaching over more centuries and permeating higher orders of society than that of any man before or since, the distinctly avowed and oft-repeated declaration by himself, that he received all from this same Jesus Christ—these are indeed the "Ossa on Pelion," not of "improbabilities," but of moral certainties; the "Olympus," whose height, thus far, no infidels have scaled, and against whose base of truth, firmer than adamantine walls, their shafts have found "bloodless sheaths."

OBJECTION III.—"NO CAUSES ADEQUATE FOR THE SCENES OF PENTECOST."

The next feature of the article before us worthy of note is the interpretation of the scenes of Pentecost. During the life of Christ "we had the most prodigious causes and the most insignificant effects;" "now the case is just reversed," says our objector; that is, on Pentecost we have the most insignificant causes and the most

stupendous effects. This may be a satisfactory statement to an unbeliever, but we think it will bear investigation a little. First, what are the causes at work in each case? During Christ's personal ministry, as already shown, no effort was made to attract the attention of the world at large; not a passage of Scripture in the New Testament, not a principle in Christ's government, can be adduced to remove the truth of that position. His miracles were performed without ostentation, and his good works without trumpet heraldry. He associated mainly with the humbler classes, and confined the greater part of his labors to personal benefits and blessings. He even prohibited the recipients of his favor from telling it abroad. If his miracles were called in question, or his motives impugned, with rare exceptions, he neither made explanation nor defense, and, when called upon by the curious or the proud to give some sign of his divine character, he utterly refused. To the Scribe and Pharisee—the ruling classes, the aristocracy of the Jewish Church—he spoke in terms of unmeasured condemnation and rebuke, and, with a single exception, never betrayed the slightest concern as to what men thought of him or said about him; and even in that exception, when he asked his disciples who men said he was, the sequel justifies us in believing he did it simply and only to elicit a reply from them on which he would base, or make the occasion of laying down, one of his most fundamental principles. Now, before any infidel can become excited over “prodigious causes,” he must candidly inquire into all the relations of those causes, into their logical character as to “effects,” into just the nature of the effects that these or those particular causes are expected to produce, effects that we can expect will logically follow from them. With such a comprehensive view of the case, I do not hesitate to say that the course Christ pursued was by no means calculated to produce prodigious effects; in truth, when we subject the whole bearing of his conduct toward the ruling classes of his day to a keen and rigid analysis; and when we remember *that he refused to disclose to his own chosen apostles the main and final principles of his government, and finally left them without doing it; when we remember, too, that he refused to give them power or authority to go on with their works, but commanded them to wait indefinitely and in his absence for it; when we gather up all these leading, and, in a question of cause and effect, determining facts, the*

wonder is, indeed, not that such "insignificant effects" crowned Christ's earthly work; the wonder is he had a single disciple to his name when Pentecost came. But now the scene changes; the facts are of another class, the causes of another character; and we have now a right to look for the very "stupendous" effects which followed.

First of all, we must remind the infidel that there were at least ten days, after the "wonderful forty days," quite as wonderful as they. These ten days afforded ample opportunity for either that stolid indifference as to, or close scrutiny into, the question of the resurrection of Christ, which the infidel thinks—and for the argument we will grant rightly thinks—characterized the people of Jerusalem during this period—a period of masterly inactivity or rigid scrutiny. We may suppose it was both; that is, that some would treat the whole question as unworthy their attention, while others would investigate and decide. We may further concede too, that, having done this, each went his own way, thinking nothing, caring nothing further, about this singular Nazarene. These fifty days afforded ample opportunity for reaching such a mental condition throughout Jerusalem and as much of Judea and Galilee as had heard of the alleged works of Christ. This being done, there was no reason it should be changed. The once turbulent elements of Jewish society are now tranquil. The burning ambitions of a few, and the wild *pro et con* speculations of the many, have become evenly tempered, and all is placid as an infant's sleep. It must remain so, logically, philosophically, necessarily; so far as the Nazarene is a disturbing element, it must remain so. He has disappeared; his friends do not know where he is; his enemies do not care where he is; from the presence of both he has vanished; his words no longer, if true, can soothe the sorrowing; if false, enrage the overpious; his "appearances" even no longer disturb nor excite "the morbid fancies" of his followers; he is gone—gone forever. But "suddenly"—the right word in the right place—suddenly—this is the word with which the introduction of the new class of causes and effects is made—suddenly there came a sound from heaven. Neither time nor space, nor the need of the question, will require us to consider the phenomena of Pentecost in detail. We are to look for causes and trace their effects, to see if we have the most "insignificant" of the former, and most "stupendous" of the latter.

Let it be remarked, to begin with, then, that the sudden appearance again of these disciples of Christ, after the fifty days had apparently settled the question forever, was itself a fact that neither Jewish society nor faithful historians could ignore or overlook. The fact, too, that they appeared as the fearless and determined preachers of Christ, far bolder now that they have Christ's shadow—and that only by a "morbid fancy," according to "the great body of the most learned critics"—than they were when in person he was with them, was also a cause of no mean character; and the fact that the hearers on the occasion could in no way account for the appearance and preaching of these men, except upon the twofold ground of Christ's actual resurrection, and therefore their own guilt, must, of necessity, lead to more marked results than any thing which had previously occurred.

If the last step in the above argument be called in question, let the objector simply make up a parallel case for modern times, and inquire upon what other principle could those men have been persuaded to engage in that Pentecost preaching, and the objection will fall of its own weight. To say they were deluded, as has already been shown, is of no force beyond the first few days of the alleged resurrection; to say they were insincere contradicts their whole after life; and to say they are ambitious of place and power, regardless of the mode of obtaining it, would be equivalent to writing them down even too great fools to become successful knaves. The ambitions of life are builded on some more substantial things than morbid fancies and excited imaginations. The first Napoleon does not imagine there is a France, and then seek her diadem; he *knows* France is, then fights for her crown. No more stupid stultification of common sense, no more stupendous falsification of all history, can be made, than to assert that the apostles of Christ on this day of Pentecost were the victims, either of mental hallucination, stolid ignorance, or crafty and reckless ambition.

But another very great difference between Pentecost and any previous occasion. Whatever crimes the Jews might have been guilty of committing against Christ, such as rejecting his claims, scoffing at his teaching, trifling with his truth, *et id genus omne*, they were but once guilty of putting him to death. However, under his or his apostles' lashings, they may have quivered, or their consciences re-

coiled, they were yet in condition to plead a partial extenuation of their conduct, on the ground that Christ was yet living, and perhaps, after all, they were not worse than other men. But now Christ dies—dies at their hands, with no legal charge against him—for the cowardly Pilate washes his hands of the whole matter—and dies, too, under the, on their part, special invocation that his blood be upon their heads.

Here is a culmination of events. Men must be hardened wretches, indeed, who can put a fellow being to death with no compunctions, with no after-thought of the dreadful crime. They may—these men probably did—put it from their thoughts for a short time; but it is “a ghost that will not down;” and when, after fifty days of apparent quiet, all Jerusalem is suddenly filled with an uproar, and the people go rushing with one accord into the Temple to discern the occasion, the climax of causes is reached. They hear these same fishermen, with a boldness that knows no quailing, not only reaffirming their faith in the Nazarene, not only preaching, in the most positive and confident manner, his resurrection, but charging home to the hearts of the crowd that they were his murderers. A crisis is reached; these men know that they have put that same Jesus to death; they know that they are now publicly charged with it; they know that there are but two modes of escape—the one to refute the claim that he is risen, and thereby, if not escape the fact they did kill a man, at least escape the terrible crime of having killed their own Messiah; the other, to frankly acknowledge their crime, and ask how they can escape the consequences. They chose the latter. To say they did this prematurely; to say they were under undue excitement; to say their fancies were morbidly excited, and that the phenomena of Pentecost were only delusive appearances; to say that it was just an easy method of getting rid of the speakers of the occasion; in a word, to say they had not a most comprehensive and thorough view of the whole case, and acted upon that view, is to suppose, to put it most mildly, that men in that age had a very unaccountable method of action? No; the truth must force itself upon the attention of every candid reader, that Pentecost was not only and simply a display of a few singular phenomena, accompanied by a short speech by the apostle Peter, but it was the climax, the grand summing up, of a tremendous series of causes, each one in its place, having its own peculiar force and significance, but all combined and centered on one point, and that one

point the resurrection of Christ. This, done by men who fifty days before had surrendered their "fancies" and gone back to their nets and their fishing; this, done in the open light of Jerusalem, in the opening of one of their most splendid national occasions; this, done with the representatives of all civilized nations present to witness it; this, done in behalf of a man alleged by the Jews to be dead, whose dead body could at any moment have been produced if—indeed, he were dead; and this, done not for the moment, but for all time—not for Jerusalem, but for the world—all this forms the culmination of those "prodigious causes" from which we have, on Pentecost, the right to expect—nor do we expect in vain—the most stupendous effects.

OBJECTION IV.—"CONCESSIONS OF PROFESSOR FISHER, PASCAL,
AND OTHERS."

The only points farther, in the article under review, that I desire to notice, are the writer's reference to certain authors—Professor Fisher, the reviewer of Maurice, Pascal, etc. I might here urge that Christianity is under no obligations to answer such objections, on the ground that they lie really against theology instead of the New Testament, as I have previously shown; yet not to seem to seek to avoid any issue, let us briefly examine what there may be in them. First, of Professor Fisher's statement, that a certain state of preparation of heart is necessary, or the "evidence" will not be found sufficient. This is true, or not true, as one applies the words; but in so far as it is true in its widest sense, it is equally true of any other book as well as the New Testament—of any other subject as well as Christianity. There are certain laws of evidence, certain principles, under whose workings no testimony will take effect, or all true testimony will take effect. Professor Fisher knows this as well as any other man, and his critic ought to, or not quote from his works. If, for example, a man come to the New Testament with his mind already made up to find this or that particular doctrine, he will be quite sure to find it—find the most satisfactory evidence to sustain it. If, on the other hand, a man approach the Bible with the intent of overthrowing its claims, he will be sure to find the evidence of its truth unsatisfactory. If the habits and practices of a man are condemned by the Bible, and he still desire to indulge those habits, such a one will certainly find the evidence not satisfactory; even so, if a man,

long supposing himself a believer in the Bible, is suddenly aroused to find the practices of his Church quite at variance with the Bible, he will be as likely to begin to call the Bible in question as his Church, such being the force of Church tradition and early teaching. In all these cases, and in others that might be named, no one need call in question Professor Fisher's statement, or be troubled by it. But the true test of evidence is its effect upon an unprejudiced, unprepossessed mind. All civilized governments recognize this: a jurymen is questioned as to his knowledge or opinions in the case now to be tried; if his mind is already occupied, he is dismissed, and another called to his place. The Bible, though of God, is a book, and, as a book, is subject to the same rules of inspection as other books. The testimony concerning Christ, though pointing to extraordinary facts, is, nevertheless, human testimony, and must be tried by the same rules, and certainly has the same rights, as testimony in any modern court. What, then, is the answer to this question? Approach the New Testament testimony with a mind ready to receive simple truth, no matter what that truth may be, or where it will lead, and the fact that, in spite of all the vigorous efforts of infidelity to overthrow it, the New Testament has survived eighteen centuries, and in the light and knowledge of the nineteenth has more reverent believers in it than ever before, is a sufficient answer.

Concerning that "English divine," Pascal, and others, I have only to remark, that they reflect that particular sentiment which is the legitimate outgrowth of their theology, and would be as likely to give up the "historic argument," or "cleave to metaphysics," as Darwin would cling to "the survival of the fittest" doctrine, or Tyndall cleave to physics without the *meta*. And why this? From the very evident reason, as already shown, that no system of theology as such can be maintained by the Bible. And men, whether great or small, whether the immortal Pascal or the mortal John Smith, who mistake their own dogmata for pure Christian doctrine or New Testament evidence will be sure to think a change of base necessary with respect to that doctrine or evidence, whenever their favorite dogmas have been shaken or removed out of the way. The fact is not to be disguised, that most of theological effort, since the Reformation by Luther, has been wasted on words and names, instead of being directed to the development of the Christian life. It must, further, be frankly conceded that

infidelity has gained great advantage thereby; so much that it, mistaking the chaff for the wheat, is really supposing the whole fabric of Christianity about to fall into a shapeless and irretrievable mass of ruins. Nothing of the sort. The hot fires through which it is passing will only serve to consume the rubbish, and leave the imperishable temple only the more glorious for the fiery ordeal through which it proves itself capable of passing.

OBJECTION V.—“THE HISTORY MAY NOT, IT MUST, BE TRUE.”

A word now about the “*may*” and “*must*” of truth. Of the history of Christ’s resurrection, our objector says, the apologist has only shown that “it *may* be true,” and demands, therefore “it *must* be true;” and adds, “There is all the difference in the world between *may* and *must*.”

To this I reply with two answers: First, it depends entirely upon circumstances whether a thing “*must* be true” or not. If infidel objectors—especially those who sail under the garb of much learning—will give a little heed to the relative character of words, they will find that, in most cases demanding proof, the probability is all that can be reached, no matter who or what authority demands more. If by “*must*,” therefore, we mean that all pertinent probabilities, that is, all that bear on the case at all, “*must*” bear in its favor, then it is simply impossible to prove any thing true whatever, except the few facts that can be made tangible to our senses; and even then *illusions* and *collusions* will be so imminent, and, when present or practiced, so potent, that a careful man full of honesty would hesitate to testify positively to any thing.

Secondly, I reply that, by such a rule, no great historic fact in any department can ever be established. I ask an infidel, for instance, who wrote the plays usually called Shakespeare; he answers, perhaps with astonishment, Shakespeare, of course. I ask, Can you prove that by the facts of history, beyond *any* doubt? He is an ignoramus of quite pure water who would answer that in the affirmative. But if I even ask, Can you prove it beyond any *reasonable* doubt? still any man read in modern controversy would hesitate to answer yes. What would he answer? what *must* he answer? Something like the following: I can prove to my own satisfaction, and I think to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind, the authorship in question;

and of all the probabilities that bear on it, I can certainly show the great preponderance in my favor. And is this all? Certainly all; and certainly all that can be said of any event in any thing at least like the remote past.

Upon general principles, let me further remark, that every infidel destroys, in the very outset, the validity of his argument against the historic narrative in question. Does he ask why? Because he quotes contemporaneous history and gives it a force he denies to the other; he quotes equally remote records with the New Testament to overthrow its records; accords to the alleged counter-statements full truth as the means of establishing the lack of truth in the point at issue. Suppose, now, the fronts are changed; suppose I say that before any ancient writer can be received against the New Testament writers, their writings are to be proved true—no “*may*” about it, I insist they “*must* be true”—where, now, will the objector stand?

But again I remark that the contents of a book, as to whether they do or do not please the fancy, or cater to the passions of a man, have very much to do in deciding his faith in that book. Take, for example, the eager haste with which some few phases of modern science have been snatched after, because of some supposed contradiction of the Bible; see with what hot speed such comets and meteors in the moral heavens as Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, Proctor, *et id genus omne*, have been run after, because it was supposed they had found the charmed Eldorado—the real fountain of life; with what ease men gulped down the monstrous camels of “development,” “survival of the fittest,” “matter the potency of life,” the age of the world, the exact time to fill the delta of a river, or wear away the rock of Niagara; observe with what a pliant and easy knee the whole infidel school have bowed to testimony, which, if it had no other objection, is new and crude—but add thereto testimony brought forward by a few men at the very threshold of a science, and by men who are yet almost totally disagreed among themselves touching some of the most vital points in their respective theories. Take note of all this; compare it with the testimony which, however vulnerable, has at least the credit of eighteen hundred years’ standing, and the credit of being stereotyped, so that it can not be one thing to-day, and, by way of evasion, another thing to-morrow; add to this that the narrative in question is the only one that even makes a decent pretense at the unfolding of

the future for man—and surely we think that, though “every now and then a bolder foot oversteps the boundary forever,” the “bolder feet” will lead but few astray. And, as time moves on, and men become better acquainted with themselves, with each other, understand better the stupendous capabilities with which they are endowed, instead of overstepping the only border land of faith that can disclose the eternal, instead of closing the ear to the only voice that ever echoed back the cry of victory over death, instead of turning away from the only leader who ever passed the gateway of the grave to bring back the light of life and immortality from the shadows of eternal night—instead of these, men will cleave to the Crucified; yea, to the Risen One; cleave to him as their only Hope and Redeemer; cleave to him living; cleave to him dying; and find at length eternity only sufficient to render him, with the Father, the homage due their great and glorious names.

VI.—THE INSTABILITY OF SCIENCE, AND THE INCOMPARABLE STABILITY OF THE BIBLE.

AMONG the points alluded to in my article, in the January number of the *QUARTERLY*, is that the Drift formation is the most superficial geological deposit of the pre-Adamic ages. This proposition was postulated upon the assumption that the geological textbooks are correct. But, as the time when the cataclysm occurred is in dispute, it seems necessary to examine the matter further; for upon an elucidation of the subject depends the credibility of another proposition or two—the antiquity of man on the one hand, and the recent origin of the human race on the other—another battle-field upon which modern Agamemnons are measuring their steel.

As these subjects will be examined more in detail by and by, we will turn immediately to notice the subject in hand.

THE INSTABILITY OF SCIENCE.

Darwinism, Lamarckian evolution, etc., although quite ancient in their inception, have been resurrected from the tomb of the past by

keen, shrewd scientists ; newly vamping and environing their subjects with drapery so attracting as to confound, bewilder, and allure myriads into their faith. The danger, if any, does not arise from the bold, arrogant speculations of atheistic scientists, but, rather, from the smooth and polished theistic believers, and teachers of science, who hold to evolution theories. Diabolos of old was a capital lay preacher, endowed with the gift of speech, and familiar with the Scriptures. By his seductive speech and apt quotation he captivated the denizens of Paradise, and wrought a world of mischief. There are apt lay preachers at the present time. Buchanan, speaking of physical evolution, wrote, as long ago as 1859, "that if it were established, it would not follow from this, as a necessary consequence, that the peculiar evidence of theism would be thereby destroyed, or even diminished."

Dr. Winchell says :

"But suppose the old doctrine of specific creations to become untenable, and the doctrine of a genealogical succession and connection of organic beings to be established in its place ; suppose it is convincingly proven, by and by, that man is descended from a monkey or an ascidian or a monad—what have we to say?"

I have to say, in reference to this matter, that there are no reasons for alarm on the subject ; for God is the author of the realms of nature, as well as the author of the Bible, and his Word and works will forever harmonize. But let us hear him again.

"Now, as no person can believe that two necessary truths will ever appear in conflict with each other, it necessarily follows that these religious beliefs can never be successfully impugned, and that we may fold our arms and smile placidly at any movements of science which seem to be directed against them. Suppose, then, the time should come when we should feel bound, by the dictates of reason and of science, to accept the doctrine of the derivative evolution of organic types, would that necessarily subvert any fundamental doctrine which we have received from our sacred Scriptures ? We answer, deliberately and confidently, No ; and we will define, in brief, the grounds on which we stand : First. The authority of those Scriptures has been fully vindicated by the revelations of history, language, ethnology, archæology, and science ; and we have a *priori* ground for asserting that their veracity will continue to be vindicated. Second. *If*, then, they are the utterances of God's truth, they must harmonize with any other utterances of God's truth. But we do not rely solely upon these abstract, deductive propositions. We bring the specific points of comparison directly into the light of investigation, and demand, what must follow from the established fact, that the admitted developmental succession of organic types has been realized through the operation of secondary causes. When we look the problem squarely in the face, we smile in

amazement that it has seemed necessary to propound it. Is it less credible that man as a species should have been developed by secondary causes from an ape, than that by such means man as an individual should rise from a new-born babe or a primitive ovum? It is no more derogatory to man's dignity to have been, at some former period, an ape, than to have been that red lump of mere flesh which we call a human infant. And if the means by which the babe has developed into a man do not, to the common mind, seem to exclude Deity from the process, why should we feel that Deity is necessarily excluded from a similar process in leading man up from the monkey? No reason can be assigned. (?) If you say that the babe is the man in potentiality, so may it be replied that the monkey is the man in potentiality—and so the quadruped, the reptile, or the fish. It does not exclude divine agency from the work of organic advancement to assume that it has been effected through the reproductive and other physiological processes. The Creator no less made man if he caused him to be derived by descent from an orang-outang. Man's structural organism stands in a relation of affinity to that of the monkey, which is rendered no more intimate or absolute by the admission that they belong to the same genealogical tree; and man's intellectual and moral superiority is just as emphatic and distinguishing, and just as much a divine in-breathing, as if it were the crowning grace of an organism which could not illustrate one plan and one intelligence, in the whole creation. If specific types come into being derivatively, the utmost that can be said is that this was the divine method of creating.

"We can not logically hesitate to entertain similar views in reference to the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, or, more accurately, of archegensis. Shall it be proven that organization comes forth from certain forms and conditions of dead matter, we shall simply say that this is the divine method of creating. And when we can finally look upon the living, conscious, moving being rising above the true horizon of existence, we shall feel awed at the spectacle, and acknowledge ourselves brought into the nearer, visible presence of Creative Divinity.

"All we seek is the truth. All truth is God's truth; and the most devout act is the hearty acceptance of truth. So thought the theist of antiquity, who, like Anaxagoras, Pliny and Plutarch, held to the evolution of certain forms of life from dead matter. So thought the priests of the Middle Ages, who held, with the philosophers, that many of the simple forms of animals and plants were generated directly from earthy slime and fermenting substances. So thought Moses, apparently, when he wrote, in speaking of the first appearance of vegetation, that 'the earth brought forth grass;' and when, in speaking of the advent of marine creatures and terrestrial animals, that 'the waters brought them forth,' and 'the earth brought them forth.' As if to render it intelligible that this method of creation does not preclude the idea of God, the historian tells us that '*God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature . . . and it was so.*' That, then, was God's method of creating. This seems like the best evidence we have in support of the doctrine of archegensis."

I have quoted thus copiously from Dr. Winchell's "Doctrine of Evolution," because it is *multum in parvo*, and contains a fair statement of the evolution theory, and the best defense that has been, or can be, made for it. This, then, is Darwinism as it now is. These

are the themes, this the logic, with which we have to contend. Here the propositions are stated, and the smooth, seductive arguments given, and quotations artfully made from the sacred text in proof of the same.

Notwithstanding the broad platform of evolution is acknowledged to be, by its best advocates, an unproved problem, a speculation, yet it is so skillfully argued that it is calculated to deceive the very elect if possible. Let us look at the issues involved for a short time. The leading thought in the above quotation is, that man descends by evolution from a monkey or an ascidian or a monad. The Bible declares that the "kinds," or species, are fixed, and do not run into one another. "Let the land grow grass, herb yielding seed, fruit tree bearing fruit *after its kind*." (Genesis i, 11.) Here the theory of new species of plants being developed from another is most emphatically denied. "Then God said, Let the waters abound with the crawler that hath breath and life, and let fowl fly above the earth, upon the face of the expanse of the skies. Then God created the great fishes and every living, breathing thing that creepeth, with which the waters abounded *after their kind*, and every bird of wing *after its kind*." (Genesis i, 20, 21.) "Let the waters abound with the crawler that hath breath and life;" or, as in the Hebrew, "shall creep, teem, swarm with the creeping thing."

The first definition given to the Hebrew word מין (*min*) by Gesenius is "species." The word used in the current translation is "kind." Dr. Winchell asks, "Is it less credible that man as a species should have been developed by secondary causes from an ape, than that by such means man as an individual should rise from a new-born babe or a primitive ovum?" Not at all, if it had been God's plan of operation; but his expressed plan is, "Let every thing bring forth *after its kind*," or species. Webster says a species is, "A *permanent* class of existing things, or beings, associated according to attributes, or properties which are determined by scientific observation." Dr. Winchell further says: "It is no more derogatory to man's dignity to have been, at some former period, an ape, than to have been that red lump of mere flesh which we call a human infant. And if the means by which the babe has developed into a man do not, to the common mind, seem to exclude Deity from the process, why should we feel that Deity is necessarily excluded from a similar process in leading man

up from the monkey?" Simply because it is God's plan that every animal and plant "shall bring forth *after its kind*," or species. Suppose Dr. Winchell should take a young monkey and feed it upon milk-porridge, and I should take a new-born male human infant and feed it on the same; which do you think would first be developed into a man?

Dr. Winchell tells us that "Anaxagoras, Pliny, and Plutarch held to the evolution of certain forms of life from dead matter." And so do some modern knights hold the same doctrine—that from the decaying carcass of a defunct swine innumerable vermicula are evolved. His argumentation is ingenious and persuasive; but the major premise of his proposition is false. His proposition is, "that man is developed from a monkey." There is not an example in the archives of our planet showing that man ever was evolved from a monkey, or any thing else but a primitive ovum. This whole doctrine is antagonized by the statements in the eleventh, twentieth, and twenty-first verses of Genesis i: "Let the earth grow grass;" "let the waters crawl with the crawlers;" the verb and noun having the same root. The waters are not the cause, but the element, of the fish, as the air is of the fowl, and the ground of the grass, herb, and tree. But, in the face of all this, we are told that "we may admit all that Darwin teaches, and yet do no violence to the Sacred Text."

Evolution, as now taught and advocated, to say the best for it we can, is but scientific speculation; and, in all probability, in two or three decades of years it will present a front so different as to be scarcely recognizable by its present advocates, for such is the

FICKLENESS OF SCIENCE,

as we will now proceed to notice.

In 1815, Lamarck published his great "*Histoire des Animaux sans Vertèbres*," in which he advocated the theory of the "Variation of Species." Some years ago, Mr. Lyell wrote a refutation of the book and the theory; but subsequently revived the theory and advocated it. He is a conscientious physicist, though, like other men, liable to err. Mr. Lyell, it is said, "has also greatly modified his views with reference to the phenomena and date of the Glacial Period." He has deducted at least one-half from his former computation, and within a

short time past he has been "compelled to recast his nomenclature of the Pliocene and Post-pliocene Ages."

These oscillations up and down the scale geological should admonish us that the most learned and cautious students of the natural record are liable to misinterpret the text, and that the instability of science is too apparent to admit of ultimate conclusions.

Until recently, geologists taught that the earth was originally in a condition of igneous fluidity—the theory of a central heat universally obtained. But now we are taught by Sir Charles Lyell that the increase of heat as we descend into the earth may be explained "without the necessity of our appealing to an original central heat, or the igneous fluidity of the central part of the earth." And yet we are assured by Professor Dana "that the facts of geology leave little room for doubt that the earth was once in fusion, and has been through all time a cooling globe." Professor Hitchcock and others affirm that "previous to the formation of the lowest solid rocks the whole globe was in a state of igneous fusion." It is evident, therefore, that science is considerably unsettled and often in error; that the opinions current to-day, are, in a great many cases, not the opinions of a few years to come; and that "pre-eminent for instability among all the sciences is geology." May it not, therefore, turn out that man is not descended from an ape, and that the Mosaic chronology is nearer the truth than that of Dr. Dawler or Sir Charles Lyell, who, a few years since, said the Glacial Age reached back eight hundred thousand years, which he now says is only two hundred thousand? In all probability, the next issue will record that the Drift Period can not be beyond six or seven thousand years, which will make the Mosaic chronology at least credible.

The quotations we have made show that in many instances man has gained less than he supposed. Not every apparent advance has been real. The approved science of to-day often discredits the science of by-gone days. Notwithstanding this, progress, in every age, has been made; and, notably in modern times, science has cleared itself of false methods of operation, and much speculation has been culled out, leaving the gems of ascertained fact.

Science is knowledge well arranged; before its voice every one must bow. But the line between science and speculation must be drawn by a clear head. Science takes nothing for granted. Science

must be assured of its data, and must be certain that it is in possession of all the data; facts and phenomena are not reached by induction, but only general truths. The facts and phenomena must be under actual observation. From facts and phenomena, general truths arise and are established, and from these we come to safe conclusions regarding the processes of nature. Hence, the man who undertakes to account for the origin of species, and the descent of man, from phenomena which belong only to the modification of species, is unscientific.

Scientists are disposed to discredit all belief that is not founded upon scientific experiment and analysis. This, however, is not true; for man's mental constitution is such as to enable him to believe on grounds of analysis and demonstration, and also upon testimony. Reliable testimony demands credence, as well as scientific demonstration. The world abounds with things we can never know only upon testimony. The rings of Saturn can be observed by only a few of the inhabitants of the earth; the great majority receive the facts on the testimony of those who have had access to the telescope. The great facts concerning man's origin and destiny we must obtain through testimony—divine testimony. "The world, by wisdom, knew not God." Nor can the scientist, by analyzing natural phenomena, find him out in modern times. This knowledge must be received upon divine testimony. The Bible is the only witness. Is it credible? It comes down to us, through the ages, unscarred and unscathed by the fiery darts hurled against it for thousands of years. And to-day it has a stronger hold upon the faith of man, and, consequently, is more impregnable, than in any previous age. He who attempts to solve the problem of the origin of the universe—of man's origin and destiny—by scientific analysis, will utterly fail, and that without remedy.

We have briefly noticed a few of the facts and arguments showing the instability of science and scientist; we wish now to ask attention to what may be said concerning the

INCOMPARABLE STABILITY OF THE BIBLE.

The stability and invulnerability of the Bible may be inferred from the results of the attacks made upon it in the ages past by deistic and atheistic critics and scientists.

From the dawn of science until now, new discoveries have been made from time to time ; and every new system and every new opinion in philosophy and science has been compared with the teachings of the Bible ; and when any seeming discrepancy has been discovered, it has been compelled to give battle. It has been aptly said, that "any knight who may please to wind his horn at its castle-gates can summon it out to maintain its cause ;" and, if it should fail in a single instance, all is lost. For many centuries this has been the case, and still is. Far back in the days of the Cæsars, it had to encounter the learning of that time—the traditions and memories of Egyptian civilization, science, and art ; and, if possible, farther back, to the days of Zoroaster and his doctrine of the causation of cosmical matter and astronomical phenomena. It had to contend with the teachings of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle ; with the philosophy and logic of Celsus ; the learning and criticisms of Porphyry, whose life was mainly spent in writing against the Bible. By Tacitus, and Pliny the younger, it is called "a crooked and immoderate superstition." Hence, the Bible had to contend with the learning of that age of the world in which the Pyramids were produced, "the temples of Thebes, the Vendidad, the Vedas, the Parthenon, the Apollo Belvidere, the astronomy and the arts of Egypt and Babylon, the works of Herodotus, Thucydides, and Epictetus." And in modern times it has to contend with the animadversions of Huxley, Tyndall, Lubbock, Lyell, Grote, Mill, Spencer, Tennyson, Vogt, Büchner, and other scientists. And as the Milesian philosopher, Anaximander, taught, nearly six hundred years before the Christian era, that "men were born of earth and water mixed, and heated by the beams of the sun," what more do modern scientists, when they teach that man is derived, by evolution, from a monad ? The Bible has not only encountered the bold attacks made by scientists, but a more subtle class, who come under the head of philosophers and critics ; among whom we may mention Polition, Ficinus, Poggio, Cardinal Bembo, Averroes, Lord Herbert, Hobbes, and Spinoza. And in the transitional period, between the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we may mention Toland and Shaftesbury. To these we may add Woolston, Paulus, Dr. Tindal, Morgan, Bolingbroke, Hume, Voltaire, Helvetius, Rousseau, Condillac, the founder of the French materialistic philosophy. Gibbon and Paine followed suit ; Cabanis and Volney, Semler, Eichhorn, Kant,

Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, De Wette, and Strauss. All these illustrious personages, with might and main, hurled their materialistic, deistic, and atheistic "boomerangs" against the Sacred Text; but, missing the mark, the missiles returned to fall at the feet of the manipulators. The history of the labors of these men will show with what inconsiderate haste scientists often promulgate new theories. All these attacks on the Bible have failed. The men who made and pursued them are nearly all forgotten. While the Bible holds stronger sway over the minds and consciences of more men now than at any previous time.

The following sketch from "*La Bible et la Science Moderne*," by M. Pouchaud, will serve to show how evanescent are the speculations and theories of man:

"Depuis l'époque de Buffon les systèmes se sont élevés les uns à côté des autres en si grand nombre, qu'en 1806 l'Institut de France comptait plus de quatre-vingts théories hostiles aux Saintes Ecritures. Aucune n'est restée debout jusqu'à ce jour."

And while these eighty theories were permitted to pass unattacked by logicians of theistic belief, they essayed to wear the habiliments of science; but, as soon as the light of the Bible was permitted to shine upon them, they faded like mist before the rising sun, "for not one of them," says Pouchaud, "survives to this day."

No other book on earth has been attacked by such a retinue of scientific and learned assailants as the Bible; and no other book has achieved such signal triumphs over its assailants; for it has not been, up to this day, convicted of a single blunder. We know that it is no part of the design of the Bible to teach the round of the physical sciences, yet revealed and scientific truth touch each other occasionally, and, when they do come in contact, they must harmonize, for God is the author of nature as well as the Bible; and if the facts of the Bible come within the purview of science, it is proper that they be submitted to the test of scientific examination. If, in a single instance, it is made to appear that there is a contradiction between an established truth of nature and the Bible, the whole book will be set aside as false.

The literature of high antiquity comes down to our times replete with the philosophy and science then taught; and the discoveries of subsequent ages have clearly shown the ignorance and errors of the

past. I will, by way of illustration, adduce an instance or two. Hesiod, in his description of the earth's position between Heaven and Tartarus, says :

"From the high heavens a brazen anvil cast
Nine days and nights in rapid whirls would last,
And reach the earth the tenth, whence strongly hurled,
The same the passage to the infernal world."

This statement appears absurd to a modern astronomer, since it is known to him that for a body to fall even from the sun would require no less than sixty-four days and a half; and from the fixed stars, instead of nine days, as asserted by the Greek author, it would require more than forty-two millions of days.

Again: Herodotus gives an account of a naval expedition sent out by the government of Egypt. The expedition went along the western coast of Africa, and returned after the lapse of three years. In the official report of that expedition it was stated that they had reached a point where their shadows, at noon, fell toward the south. This statement conflicted with the teachings of the science of that time, and Herodotus declares the whole report as unworthy of confidence. Hence we perceive that physical science, as taught in the days of Herodotus, has given place to modern scientific research.

If we were to find such immature statements within the limits of the sacred volume put forth as substantial or established truth, our faith in its Divine origin would end. The Bible was written in an age when a false cosmogony and a false astronomy were every-where received, and if the writers had not been guided by the omniscient mind, they surely would have, in many things, betrayed an ignorance of physical truth which would certainly bring it into disrepute, as the laws of nature were developed and understood. But is there an instance on record?

"The Bible," says Bishop Marvin, "is entitled to be regarded with intelligence and candor as to any minute verbal criticisms, as well in view of the imperfect state of language as the vehicle of scientific thought at the time it was written, as on general grounds of fair criticism. In a popular treatise upon any theme, in popular language, though it may trench on questions of science, the author is not expected to observe the formalities of scientific speech, though he is expected to conform his statements to scientific accuracy. If,

in describing a sunset at sea, he should simply say the sun sank into the water, no fair-minded critic would think of charging him with a want of accuracy, though any man describing the same phenomenon, with a view to the known facts of science, would use very different terms, even when the reader is supposed to know the facts as to celestial phenomena. A writer upon themes not strictly scientific uses language in this popular way. And indeed, sometimes, even now, when one would actually look for accuracy, as in an almanac, for instance, you find such phrases as the 'sun rises,' the 'sun sets,' when in strict truth he does neither. The Bible can not be convicted of blunders with regard to science, upon any such shallow and frivolous pretext as that it uses *popular* language when it speaks of matters involving scientific phenomena. Not only popular language, but also poetic license, if you please, is to be regarded in the same fair light in this as in any other books. A considerable part of it is poetry of the highest order, in which the thought is incandescent with passionate fervor, and thus incarnate in glowing imagery. He who insists on trying this by the straight edge of formal scientific criticism betrays either a narrowness or a disingenuousness which disqualifies him altogether for the function of criticism." He further says: "If the Bible, written at a time when there was but little knowledge of scientific truth, and in a language therefore not favorable to scientific accuracy, has not been convicted of actual scientific falsehood in any one case, after all the light of the nineteenth century has been turned upon it, and the most strenuous effort of criticism has been expended, that fact raises the strongest presumption in its favor; for it is inconceivable that writings so voluminous, touching upon so many points at which there was opportunity to blunder, in an age of absolute ignorance as to these truths, should have escaped errors at once gross and numerous, if they had not been presided over by divine intelligence. Now that, in the light of any fair criticism, this book is free from such blunders is unquestionably true. Every effort to convict it of error falls in the category of one or the other of two classes of false criticism already alluded to. The alleged errors are the apparent but not real inaccuracies of poetic fervor and freedom, or of popular forms of language. Of the first class are such expressions as 'the foundations of the earth,' 'the pillars of heaven,' 'the end of the world,' 'a tabernacle

for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoicing as a strong man to run a race,' 'his going forth is from the end of the heavens, and his circuit unto the ends of it.' Of the second class there may be mentioned these phrases, 'the sun stood still,' 'the face of the earth,' the like of which are in common use even now. Allegations on grounds so frivolous stand self-convicted, and I say without fear that, *as to any established doctrine of science*, no grave ground of objection can be laid. No one text, fairly interpreted, has ever been put to the blush in the presence of any one truth of science."

Let us pursue this line of thought a little further. Thousands of years ago, in an age when the science of astronomy was very imperfectly understood compared with its present status, the patriarch Job said, "God stretched out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." Modern astronomy teaches that the "earth is a star among the stars," and governed by the same law—gravitation—a law by which God is "pleased to manifest his power in the guidance of the orbs of heaven. To a knowledge of that law of operation, man has been permitted to reach." Again, Jehovah said to Job: "Who shut up the sea with doors when it broke forth, as if it had issued out of the womb? When I made the cloud the garment thereof, and thick darkness a swaddling band for it, and established my decree upon it, and set bars and doors, and said, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no farther; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed." In this language, written in an age when physical science was unknown, we have the germ of all that physical science has revealed concerning the phenomena of the tides. The stability of the sea involves the organization of the whole solar system.

Some years ago, astronomers taught that the moon has been slowly approaching the earth from the earliest ages of the world. From this motion, the tides due to her influence are now higher than they were in the days of Homer. If this motion were to continue, the time will certainly come when the tides, rising above every obstacle, will whelm the earth, and the decree of the Bible, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed," would be false, and infidelity would triumph. But astronomical science, better understood, has discovered the fact that this decrease of the moon's distance, due to planetary disturbance

of the figure of the earth's orbit, had its limits fixed quite as positively as those by which God has declared he would restrain the ocean. It is now asserted by astronomers, that the time is coming when the decrease of distance will be changed into an increase, and the moon will slowly leave the earth by the same degrees by which it had, for thousands of years, made its approach, and with it the decrease of the tides; and God's decree, "Hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther; and here shall the pride of thy waves be stayed," is found to be true, and the infidel scientist caused to blush.

Many more quotations from the Bible might be given, showing that science had been truly anticipated, but we will give one more, and then close this part of the subject. God said to Job, "Hast thou commanded the morning since thy days, and caused the day-spring from on high to know his place? That it might take hold of the ends of the earth, it is turned as clay to the seal, and they stand as a garment." It is evident that reference is here made to the admirable order of recurrence of day and night, and the beautiful adjustment by which the dawn breaks upon the earth. "It is turned as clay to the seal," or, as in the Hebrew, "turns itself," evidently alluding to the rotation of the earth on its axis, illustrated by the rolling cylinder seal, such as is found in Babylon, which leaves its impression on the clay, as it is turned about; so the morning light, rolling on over the earth, presenting a variety of forms—mountains and hills, "waving forest and verdant meadows."

But this is not all that is taught in the text. "With how much precision has the day-spring from on high been taught to know his place," and how great the results! "For more than three thousand years science has gone backward, and, with profound research, reveals the fact that in that vast period the length of the day has not changed by the hundredth part of a single second of time." No matter how numerous the causes of change, how diversified in their action, how multiplied in their effects, out of them comes an admirable equilibrium, and the earth, with undying velocity, spins on its sleeping axis. None but the astronomer, in the observatory, can fully appreciate the force of this language. With what implicit confidence he relies on the mighty truth that God has taught the "day-spring from on high to know his place!" "He wished to signalize the meridian passage of his star." "On the preceding night it has passed at such a

moment of time, marked on the face of his clock, and again to-night at the same hour, minute, and second, and even to the very thousandth of a second, true to the bidding of one unchanging Will, his telescope, borne by the revolving earth, glances the visual ray to the very center of the same identical star."

But why this nice uniformity of motion? The scientific answer is, "from the rotation of the earth we derive our unit of time." Besides, if the velocity of the earth should be decreased by the smallest amount, the temperature of the various regions of the earth would be deranged, disorder would enter every kingdom of nature, and, finally, destruction would follow. If the velocity were increased, the same results would necessarily follow. And, further still: "Any change of the velocity of rotation would disturb the equilibrium of the ocean, and cause it to pass the bounds which God assigned to it. For, were the earth stationary, its figure, if even spheroidal, might have maintained its form; but the moment that rotation on an axis commences, the equilibrium is disturbed, another force (the centrifugal) is introduced, and a modification of the earth's form necessarily follows. Hence the earth is protuberant at the equator and flattened at the poles, for the simple reason that, at the equatorial regions, the velocity of the particles are a maximum, and the earth is, therefore, evolved at its equator far above the level which would exist were the earth at rest." Could we arrest the earth's rotary motion, a universal deluge would be the result. With a knowledge of these facts, understanding that the day and the night results from the uniformity of the earth's rotation, and that from this same cause the ocean is restrained within the limits assigned to it, with what force does the declaration sound, "He has compassed the waters with bounds, until the day and the night shall come to an end!" I now simply ask, What contemporary of Job, uninspired, would have stated so accurately the results of scientific research?

One more allusion to the unity of the Bible and science, and I will close this article. Every two or three decades of years the Bible is attacked by some new theory or some results of scientific speculation. The last one is in reference to the destiny of the earth. This will also share the fate of the myriads of speculative hypotheses which have arisen, and have succumbed to scientific research.

In reference to the origin and destiny of planetary and stellar
VOL. VIII.—16.

worlds, Dr. Winchell, Professor Proctor, and other scientists, teach that they have had their beginning in igneous fluidity, and will end in a state of frigidity. We are told that "Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune are in a state of igneous fluidity, and hence uninhabitable, while our moon, and others of the smaller members of the solar system, are in a frozen condition," and that life on them is impossible. This, it is said, teaches that "life on our globe had a beginning and must have an end," and also a "wonderful harmony between the teachings of scientists and the Bible." In the simple fact that our world and all its tenantry had a beginning, and will have an end, there is an apparent harmony; but, in regard to the manner in which that end shall occur, there is a wide disparity between the teachings of these scientists and the Bible.

The inspired teacher informs us "that the heavens (or atmosphere) will pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." This language comes very near to an anticipation of the scientific discoveries of modern science, and yet it was written in an age when the science of chemistry was unknown. But, now that their chemistry is understood, we perceive that the language is adapted to it, in a manner which no uninspired writer would have done. The atmosphere surrounding the earth is represented as passing away with a prodigious noise—an effect which the chemist would predict by the union of its oxygen with the hydrogen and other gases liberated by the intense heat. Yet what scientist was there in those primitive times who would have imagined such a result? The apostle added to the simple statement that the "earth would be burned up," the declaration that its *elements* would be melted. Why this? The thought was that the combustion would entirely destroy the matter of the globe. But the chemist finds that the greater part of the solid earth has already been oxidized, or burned, and on this matter the only effect of the heat, unless intense enough to dissipate it, would be to melt it.

If, therefore, the apostle had said only that the world would be burned up, the skeptical chemist would have inferred that Peter had made a mistake through ignorance of chemistry. But the chemist is disarmed; he can not draw such an inference, for Peter's language clearly implies that only the combustible matter of the globe will be

burned, while the elements, or primordial principles of things, will be melted ; so that the final result will be an entire liquid, fiery globe. And at this point comes the issue, not between science and the Bible, but between far-fetched scientific speculation and the Bible. The issue is, scientists tell us, that the earth will end in a state of frigidity, while the inspired writer declares that it will be "melted with fervent heat."

VII.—GENESIS AND GEOLOGY

GENESIS does not claim to be a work on science, but a simple statement of some important facts relative to the origin of the heavens and the earth, and of some things (but not of all things) in them ; such as fishes and the sea animals, fowls, creeping things, wild and domestic animals, and man, on earth ; and of the sun, moon, and stars, in the heavens. It gives no history, in the full sense of that word, of any of them, nor does it claim to do so. *History* is a methodical statement of events, so arranged as to state, or at least suggest, the connection between causes and their effects. *Natural history* consists in a description and classification of natural objects, as minerals, plants, animals, and so forth. The first chapter of Genesis, of which we now speak, is not a record of this kind. It is not even a *history* of creation. A history of creation would require not only the statement that, "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," but also how it was done, and of what its materials consisted, and how they were arranged, and what effects these materials had on each other. It simply states that the earth was formless, empty, and dark. This is no part of the history of creation ; for the creation was finished, so far as the earth was concerned, before it could have been in this or any other condition.

The account in Genesis is not even a cosmogony ; for it does not claim to be the science of the formation of the world, nor does it contain knowledge duly arranged with reference to general truths and

principles. It gives knowledge, not as founded in the nature of things, but as revealed. The book was written for religious, not for scientific, purposes. It is not even a theological work ; for theology is a science, and not a revelation—a science which treats of the existence, character, and attributes of God ; his laws and government ; the doctrines to be believed and the duties to be done. But Genesis, as it relates to the origin of things, is not a treatise, a written discussion, or an explanation of a particular subject. It states facts, but explains nothing ; because the facts stated are, to us, inexplicable. In the statement of the facts, there is nothing obscure ; but an attempt at explanation might, nay, must, necessarily, involve us, with our present limited capacities, in inextricable intricacies.

If there is any irreconcilable contrariety between the alleged facts of Genesis and geology, then one or the other must be wrong. What are the facts stated in Genesis which are contradicted by geology ? That book says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This is uncontradicted by geology. The next fact stated is, "Now the earth was waste and empty." This is the first condition of the earth mentioned in Genesis. Geology is so far from contradicting this, that it positively affirms it. "Darkness was over the face of the abyss." Geology does not contradict this fact ; but many lovers of the science believe, from the very nature of things, that a dense fog, sufficiently so to cover the entire globe with darkness, must have been the condition of the globe while there was no land above water. The next fact, "And the spirit of God was brooding over the face of the waters." Concerning this, geology says nothing ; and there is, therefore, no contradiction. "And God said, Let there be light ; and there was light." Concerning the origin of light, geology says nothing, and therefore does not contradict Genesis. It only speaks of light in connection with the earth's development. With its origin, nature, and its manner of production, it is, as it must always be, silent. With the *origin of forms* of matter it is familiar ; and of them it speaks, and speaks sublimely. But question her as to the *origin of matter itself*, and she shrinks back in modesty, and says, "I know not." Of one thing, however, she is sure, and that is, that "there was light." In this she agrees with Genesis.

"And God divided between the light and the darkness." Ge-

ology does not teach any lessons on this subject. It recognizes the fact that light and darkness are separate, not commingled; and here is no contradiction. "And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night." The science recognizes these names as distinctive of light and darkness, but declines to say who gave them. This is no part of that science.

"And there was evening, and there was morning, one day." There is no contradiction here. All days have their evenings, whether they are solar or some other days. Concerning *time*, more will be said hereafter.

And God said, "Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it divide waters from waters. And God made the expanse; and he divided the waters which are under the expanse from the waters which are above the expanse." Geology recognizes the existence of the atmospheric expanse, and the effect ascribed to it here. And the expanse is called "heavens," to this day.

"And God said, Let the waters which are under the heavens gather themselves to one place, and let the dry land appear. And God called the dry land earth, and the gathering together of the waters he called seas." The earlier submergence and the later emergence of the land are facts of great importance in geological science. The whole theory of the formation of rocks, sedimentary, is based on the fact of a former submersion of the earth, and the sedimentary rocks now on the surface assert the emergence. The earth was "born of water."

And God said, "Let the earth put forth shoots, herb setting seed, fruit tree, bearing fruit after its kind, in which is its seed, above the earth." This fact is every-where recognized by geology, in all that relates to that science; namely, "And the earth brought forth shoots, herb setting seed after its kind, and tree producing fruit, in which is its seed, after its kind;" for "men do not gather figs from thistles, nor grapes from thorns."

And God said, "Let there be light in the expanse of the heavens, for dividing between the day and the night. And let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and for years; and let them be for lights in the expanse of the heavens, for giving light on the earth." These lights were made for the purposes specified. Though they belong more to the science of astronomy than to geology, yet they

influence the earth and its productions so much that their existence and earthly utilities are very important in geological science ; and its testimony is confirmatory of the Scriptural statement relative to their relation to our planet.

And God said, "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living beings ; and let fowl fly above the earth, along the expanse of the heavens." Geology recognizes the fact that such a state of things existed at a very remote period, and still exists.

And God said, "Let the earth bring forth the living being after its kind ;" and geology says, as Genesis says, "And it was so."

"And God made the beast of the earth after its kind, and cattle after their kind, and every reptile of the ground after its kind." The very remote antiquity of all these "kinds," and the law of inheritance, are among the earliest lessons of geology.

"And God created the man in his image ; in the image of God created he him ; as male and female created he them." -Genesis and geology both agree that man was the crowning work of this grand display of wisdom and power. Though geology, like all the natural sciences, which have nothing to do with any thing but that which *exists*, can not testify in favor of the *creation*, it is of necessity compelled to say nothing against it. On all other matters of fact, Genesis and geology are agreed ; and on the fact of a creation they never did, and never can, disagree.

Having taken this brief view of facts, we now propose to state the *periods* of Genesis, for the sake of use hereafter ; and then the periods of geology, for the same purpose.

PERIODS OF GENESIS.

1. The creation of the heavens and the earth, the waste and empty condition of the earth, the prevalence of darkness, for a time, over the face of the abyss, the brooding of the Spirit of God over the face of the waters, the production of light—"One day."

2. The making of the expanse, the separation of the vaporous from the more dense waters by the atmosphere, which was caused to expand around the globe, the naming of the expanse heavens—"A second day."

3. The separating of the waters from the land, the collecting of waters into different bodies, called "seas," the appearing of the dry

land, called earth; the bringing forth shoots, herb setting seeds, fruit tree bearing fruit after its kind—"A third day."

4. The making of the sun, moon, and stars—"A fourth day."

5. The stocking of the waters with living beings, and the atmosphere with winged animals—"A fifth day."

6. The making of land animals, and a man and a woman—"The sixth day."

THE SUBDIVISION OF GEOLOGICAL TIME.

"1. Azoic time or age." The time without life.

"2. Palæozoic time." The ancient life time. This included:

"(1.) The age of mollusks, or Silurian.

"(2.) The age of fishes, or Devonian.

"(3.) The age of coal-plants, or Carboniferous.

"3. The Mesozoic time." The middle time.

"(4.) The age of reptiles.

"4. Cenozoic time." The recent or late life time.

"5. Era of mind.

"6. The age of man." (Professor Dana.)

This division of time includes all the time which has elapsed since the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the production of light. Of these geology, as a natural science, as already remarked, can not speak. It discusses the structure, the mineral constitution, and the history of the globe. If there is any contradiction between Genesis and geology, it must be in relation to either the structure, the mineral constitution, or the history of the earth. Of the structure—that is, the form and putting together—of the earth, Genesis says nothing. Nor does it say any thing of its mineral constitution. If, therefore, there is any disagreement or contradiction between them, it must be a question of history, and history as relates to the earth and to nothing else; for this is all the history involved in geology. Not so with Genesis, which contains much historic matter in relation to the men of whose origin it speaks.

Geology begins its history of the globe with the formation of its rocks. It divides the earth into three kingdoms, which are generally named the Animal, the Plant, and the Crystal kingdoms. Genesis does the same thing, but in a different order, corresponding with the chronology of their beginning; thus, the Crystal, the Plant or

Vegetable, and the Animal. The materials of the globe come first, then the plants, then the marine animals, the land animals, and man.

We are not to infer, however, that, when one of the later periods commenced, one of the earlier ceased; for the three are all now existing, and each has its continuous history. Genesis speaks only of a few things which belong to the vegetable kingdom, as shoots, herbs, and fruit-trees, they being more intimately connected with the main object of the book. It does not say that these were all the vegetable productions of the earth. Geology, as it should, notices more. The algæ, or sea-weeds, appear to have existed first of all. Many others, too delicate for fossilization, may have existed at the same time.

The greater abundance of sea animals, near the shores of continents and of islands of the seas, indicates that much of their food comes, directly or indirectly, from the land. What are called "banks," which are formed by the influence of currents and eddies, directed and formed by contiguous lands, are the abodes of many marine animals, whose food is brought by currents from the lands and deposited, or at least detained and collected, on these banks. Microscopic animals feed on the most delicate food, and larger animals feed on them, while these again become food for still larger ones; and this lays the foundation for the adage, "The big fish eat the little ones." Many larger animals feed directly on land products in vegetable transformation, or on insects and on worms, who subsisted on some vegetable product. And though the sea may be called the mother of swarms of living beings, the land must be regarded as the father, in the sense of the *provider*, for all these children. Genesis does not go into detail on this subject, for reasons before stated; but it gives vegetable life the precedence of all animal life. Geology recognizes the first manifestation of life, and in its simplest forms, as that of plants of the lowest grade. "As plants are primarily the food of animals, there is reason for believing that the idea of life was first expressed in a plant." (Dana, Professor of Geology and Natural History in Yale College.) What this distinguished geologist says "there is reason in believing," Genesis states as a fact, long before there was a science of geology.

Geology is unable to speak of the *origin* of life. It can speak of ancient and vegetable life—the life mentioned in Genesis—but not of

its *origin*. This belongs to another department of science. There can be, therefore, no contradiction between the two here. Nor can philosophy contradict revelation here; for geology shows that there was an Azoic Age of long duration before any life dawned on our planet. Life had, then, a beginning, and is found only in connection with organic matter, *none of which could be manufactured out of inorganic matter, even with living organisms to attempt the work*. Many elements which enter into the structure of animals and plants, and subserve the proper performance of their functions, are not, in reality, constituents of organic tissues, nor of secondary products. They exist in mere physical solution, or are found as solid in the bones or teeth in purely inorganic form, and are clearly distinguishable from the state of organic combination in which the carbon, hydrogen, and nitrogen of tissues and secretory products are combined.

Life is not a chemical result. Chemical affinities are held in check by vitality. Nothing, while living, can decompose, or be resolved into its chemical constituents. Chemistry can analyze only dead matter. Life is too powerful for all its forces, and resists its entrance on analysis till vitality leaves. In that instant, seeming anxious affinities commence their work of decomposition. Life is, therefore, a vital, and not a chemical, force. An opposing, and not an allied, force is to be ever witnessed between these contestant rivals. Life in Genesis is, in its origin, imputed to the Creator; and geology, and all the sciences which are called to consider it, accept it as something already existing, the origin of which they can not reach; and they leave their admirers to accept, in reason and becoming humility, and without an attempt at contradiction, the oracle of God on the subject. Concerning the beginning of the life of vegetables and the lower animals, intimation is clear; but, concerning the life of man, it is most explicit. "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul." The breathing was not that of atmosphere, for the purpose of inflating the lungs of a living infant, but the breathing of "the breath of life," for the purpose of giving life where it was not before possessed. This life was made hereditary, to be enjoyed by many. It was literally "the breath of lives." The inflation of the lungs of a dead man with atmosphere, though often repeated, would never impart life to him. This was a case of resurrection of a dead person—a doctrine clearly revealed in the Scriptures,

and yet denied by many, though confirmed by the necessities of this case. *The first man that lived was raised from the dead.*

"Life," though so abundant in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and surrounding us and interpenetrating us at all points, is so difficult of definition that nothing satisfactory has yet been accomplished in that direction. It can neither be weighed nor measured, seen nor handled. It can not be examined by the chemist, nor produced in the laboratory. It is known only by its phenomena, and these are as various as are the kinds of life. Living matter can alone *develop* and produce materials for tissue, secretion, and deposit. It alone can grow and produce matter like itself from matter materially different from itself in its composition, its properties, and its power. No chemist can produce it. Chemistry, analytic and synthetic, is concerned in the examination of dead matter. It begins with dead matter, proceeds with dead matter, and ends where it commenced. As, in the course of nature, nothing can produce living matter but live matter itself, the question arises, Whence came the *first* living matter? Here, exactly where all the sciences are mute, Genesis says, God made it; and all the sciences meekly and reverently bow their assent to the oracle, as a revelation, justified by the only inference left them. There is no contradiction between revelation and science. In all the marvelous discoveries made by the microscope relative to the physical basis of life, there is not a single fact that contradicts any statement in Genesis.

The argument of Genesis and geology, as to the fact that the simplest organisms in both the vegetable and animal kingdoms were succeeded by the more complex, is not surprising, since truth always harmonizes; but the surprise would be great on any other hypothesis than that the fact was *revealed* in Genesis, since there was no geology to discover it in fossils, when that book was written.

Life itself is something unsolved, and, indeed, unsolvable, by science, since it comprises so many results, and exhibits changes so complicated and so diverse from each other, that the subject is inexhaustible. The life of a man or of an animal contains within it phenomena, things differing essentially in kinds, as mechanical and chemical; and also others of a class entirely different from either of these; namely, vital phenomena, which have never yet been satisfactorily accounted for. Some say that "life is the sum of all the actions

going on in the body." This "sum" consists of very different kinds of actions, the analysis of which will demonstrate the absurdity of the definition. To add all these, without reference to kind, into one "sum" total, is to confound things as different as things well can be, and leave the whole undefined and unexplained. Vital action is as distinct from mechanical and chemical as any one thing can be from another. It often successfully resists both.

It is urged that Genesis and geology differ as to *the time* required for the development of the earth, so as to become adapted to the purpose which it now subserves—the purpose of life. Six days are assigned to this grand work by the author of Genesis. As to the length of these days, nothing is said by Moses. They are not measured by seconds, minutes, and hours, like solar days. That they were not *solar* days is evident from the fact that three of them passed before *sol*, or the sun, was made luminous. The calendars which we use are based on solar time, and are made with express reference to the sun. The time occupied in the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the adjustment of all things therein, began too early for our method of time-keeping; and, having been begun, it was continued till the work was finished, without any change of method, even after the sun and moon were made

"To measure day and night
To mortal man."

A day with us consists of twenty-four hours, consisting of an average of twelve hours of light and twelve of darkness. This, however, will not hold good all over the globe. At the poles there could be but one day in a year, if a day includes alternate periods of both light and darkness.

The days of cosmical creation and development excluded the night entirely. God divided the light from the darkness, and called the light day, and the darkness night. The six days of Genesis were six periods of light, the length of which was not measured by the sun. Each day ended with an evening and commenced with a morning; the former in the retrospect, being the first toward us, is first mentioned. The day began with light, and ended when the darkness came on. This utterly excludes the twenty-four hour reckoning. It is stated that there was evening and morning in each of these six

days ; and this is not affirmed of any other days, because other days include the nights.

These days, mentioned in connection with what was done in world-making, are not affirmed to be consecutive days, in the Hebrew Scriptures. They are mentioned as successive with reference to what was done, first, second, third, etc.; as a man might say that he had worked six days on a piece of work, when several days may have intervened between each two days. He might say that he did such a part of the work "day one," and such a part "a second day," and such another part "a third day," and so forth. The same may be said with reference to the more definite but inaccurate rendering of the common version ; "the first day" meaning the first day that God worked, "the second day" meaning the second day he worked, etc., and not the first day and second of all time. The Hebrew expressions, "one day," "a second day," "a third day," and so forth, must be shown by the infidel to mean, not the first day of work, but the first day of time, and the second and third day of time, and not of work, before he can show a contradiction between Genesis and geology.

Moreover, these six days of work, if they consisted of only twelve hours each, or even of a shorter period, may have allowed intervening time enough to account for all the geological changes that occurred. The idea that it required continued time for the Almighty to do any thing, without the intervention of second causes, is very absurd. It is not stated, nor justly inferred, that the whole of either day was spent in the work done on that day. If continued time was required, it was because physical agencies were employed to effect what almighty power could have effected in an instant. The act of creation must, of necessity, have been instantaneous. For a thing could not exist by degrees. It must either exist or not exist.

The command to the Israelites to rest on the seventh day, in commemoration of the fact that God ceased from his work of creation on the seventh day, proves nothing, positively, as to the *length*, but simply as to the *number*, of the days in which all things were made. The time of their labor and rest was evidently solar time ; but we have proved that the time of his creation and development of the heavens and the earth did not begin with the rising and setting of the sun ; but before there was any sun prepared to shine on

the earth. Their six days of labor could adequately commemorate any other six days, whether long or short. The same is true, also, of their rest on the seventh day. The institution of the Sabbath, or rest, was necessary to their secular good ; and the designation of the seventh day for that purpose secured also their spiritual interest, when religiously used. To begin the account of the creation and development with ante-solar time, and end it with solar time, could only end in confusion ; and therefore the account is continued without change of time, and in the same style ; as, there was evening and there was morning, a fourth day, a fifth, and the sixth day—a style entirely unnecessary if an ordinary day was intended, as all would know that all such days included evening and morning. The intimation is pretty evident, to persons of reflection, that reference is not made to ordinary days.

If the whole of each day was spent in what is said to have been done in each, the days could not have been ordinary days, as is evident from geological science. That rocks were formed by secondary causes, no one will deny. That these causes operated very slowly, must be admitted by all. It is evinced by our own observation of rocks of the very same material in different stages of formation, from the sand-bar to the solidest sandstone rock, from soft clay to rocks made of the same material, from beds of pebble to conglomerate rocks, and so forth, through all the variety of rock formations. Rocks are "the foundation of the earth," as certainly as they are of buildings which we construct. The foundation of a building is under it ; and so is the foundation of the earth. The lowest part of a building is its foundation ; and the lowest part of the earth is its foundation ; that is, its center. It is as really down, toward the center of the earth at one point on its surface as at any other point on its surface. Solidity in this globe was indispensable to the object for which it was made, and therefore its foundation is laid deep and strong. The greater part of the globe consists of minerals. As we lay rock upon rock in the foundations of our little buildings, so God has laid stratum upon stratum, of vast thickness and extent, in the foundation of the earth. Each stratum required long ages for its formation ; and the days by which the time of this wonderful work is measured, clear up till man appeared, are long in proportion to the grandeur and glory of the works assigned to them ; and the reckoning is be-

gun before sun, moon, or stars threw their rays of light on the earth. They were God days, not human days, not solar days. If all the work had been done by the direct exertion of almighty power, excluding all secondary interference, an instant only, and not a week, would have been required. But Genesis excludes our calendar by one which measured time for God before sun, moon, or stars were made luminous for the earth. Light, independent of all these bodies, was the first-born of this lower creation. It was at first an infant—mere twilight—but became developed into an adult when God divided between the light and the darkness, and it became the measure of day; for God called the light day, and the darkness he called night.

As already noticed, creation must, of necessity, be an *instantaneous* act; for a created thing must become such instantaneously, as a thing can not exist, and not exist, at the same instant. God was not all day at work in creating the heavens and the earth, and in making light and dividing it from the darkness, as men spend time in labor. The fact that he said, "Let there be light, and there was light," does not prove that light was produced in an instant; but simply that the decree was fulfilled. The production of light (we do not say the creation of it), and the separating it from the darkness, occupied "one day." The production of light could not, as a fact of creation, have occupied even one solar day. But if it was produced by the agencies of second causes, it may have required a very long period.

The present state of science is such that we are required to speak cautiously relative to light. The nature and physical causes of it are even now among the unsettled problems of natural science. The old doctrine of the emanation of infinitesimal particles of the sun's substance to the globe, in combinations called rays, has given way to the wave theory. Now, all the phenomena of light are regarded as arising from an exceedingly attenuated medium which is thrown into waves by all kinds of luminous bodies, and which fills universal space; and is difused through the substance of the solid bodies, and occupies the spaces between their molecules, which transmit and modify these vibrations. The vibrations which produce different colors are astonishingly small, there being for violet 57,490 in one inch, and in red 39,180, while in white light 610,000,000,000,000 vibrations of this luminous matter act on the eye in one second! It is held

that two portions of light may interrupt and neutralize each other at the point of interruption, and produce darkness. Whatever would produce these vibrations would produce light, whether sun, moon, or stars existed, as such, or not. Chemical influences have much to do with light. The sun, moon, and stars are not the only light producers, as the chemist's laboratory attests, and as is seen in the effects of heat, in cases of friction, electricity, and phosphorescence. In the chemical adjustments of the fifty-four undecomposed substances, called elementary substances, of which this globe is composed, who can tell how much light and how many intervals of light may have been produced? The mysteries hanging about the subject of light caution the investigator not to be dogmatic in his statements where matters are rather problematical than clearly settled. We love the sciences, and esteem the scientific men, who have labored so faithfully and accomplished so much, and who know enough to be modest when so much remains to be learned.

Under ordinary circumstances, light and heat are associates. This is not only so with solar light and heat, but it is true in most cases in which artificial light is produced. Although little is said, comparatively, of light and heat, in geological works, they being regarded as themes of natural philosophy, they are among the most powerful agents in the great changes which have taken place in the history of the earth. In truth, there is but one great science in the universe, and what we call the sciences are only branches of it. The earth could not have been developed without these two agents; and it is not wonderful that the production of light is so early noticed in *GENESIS*; and being so closely connected with heat, the mention of one implies the existence of the other. The sun is not only a great light, but a great heat also. Latent light and latent heat are developed at the same time and by the same means. They are not only latent in terrestrial substances, but seem to have been so, primarily, in the substance of the sun, and of all the heavenly bodies also. The substance of the sun is not a simple and uniform substance. No one knows what changes took place in its primitive physical constitution before it was made "a great light; and it is therefore unphilosophic to assert that it is the first light that shone on this planet. It is neither the source of all light nor of all heat. Geologists seem satisfied that this globe was once a molten mass. If so, whence came

the heat? and was there not light also? did they both come from the sun? "God said let there be light," and, obedient to the fiat, "light was." Darkness fled before it, and thus "God divided between the light and the darkness." The darkness and the light were together before this; that is, the light was latent before this time, and was then developed. It was not solar light, but that which was developed by the brooding of the Spirit of God over the dark waters. It was the divine power which resulted in the physical laws by which matter was to be henceforth governed; and the two great chemical agents, light and heat, by which so many, and so great changes have been produced, were developed from the chaotic mass. The light and heat disengaged during chemical combinations, even in our small laboratories, is wonderful, when duly considered. What must it have been when the whole globe was a laboratory, and all the elementary substances were forming their compounds? "God said, Let light be; and light was;" and heat also.

Water, of which a vast quantity, sufficient for the baptism of the earth, had been formed, from due proportions of oxygen and hydrogen, is a powerful agent in chemical operations, not only as a solvent, but in new compounds, of which it is a constituent. In it were contained all the constituents of the earth, till God separated the land from the water. It precipitated all the mineral matter of which inorganic nature consists, and performed an important part in the formation of the rocks, which compose what is called "the earth's crust." Stratum after stratum was formed, and settled by its own specific gravity, which caused, in the descent of each, an influx of water from other localities, bringing with it diverse material for a new formation, until the forces below resisted the burdensome impositions, and threw them up in mountain ranges, parallel, or nearly so, to the great waters. Between these ranges, valleys were formed, which seem proud of their little hills, which mark their surfaces for rills and brooks and rivers for surface drainage. By these means, and the formation of an atmosphere of sufficient specific gravity to raise the vapors above the waters and the land below, "the dry land appeared." Thus we interpret Genesis thus far without any demurrer from geology. Here ends, strictly speaking, the lifeless age. In all this time no germ of life appeared, no form of life known to us could have existed amid such chemical conflicts as must have been produced. There

was earth enough and water enough, but both were unfit for life. The war of elements was too great and too severe for that tender thing which we call life.

Here the tumult ceased, but the smoke of battle was still on the field. The atmosphere was charged with too much carbonic acid to admit of animal life. It must, therefore, be disposed of in some solid form to admit of animal respiration. Evolved in large quantities, it was a capital fire-extinguisher, and served a good purpose as an extinguisher of primeval flame. Though destructive of nutriment for animal life, it is food for vegetables, which were the first living things on earth.

Genesis says nothing concerning the algæ, or sea-weeds, supposed to have been the earliest vegetable production of the earth, but proceeds directly to notice "the dry land" productions; nor does it claim to be a treatise on botany. It notices only those vegetables which are most directly connected with land-animal existence. Nor does it say that the vegetables therein mentioned were the earliest. There is, therefore, no contradiction here. Neither does it affirm that no other vegetables existed at the same time that shoots, seed-setting herbs, and fruit-trees existed. Ample room is left for the geologist to say all that his science teaches relative to the age of acrogens, or coal plants, and the ample provision for the Carboniferous Age, without contradiction from Genesis. By the production of all these plants the atmosphere was better prepared for land animals by the absorption of carbonic acid, and in other changes in the atmosphere and climate, both of which must have been materially affected by abundant vegetation.

Sea-weeds and mollusks, neither of which are expressly mentioned in Genesis, were contemporary. Genesis says that "the waters swarmed with swarms of living beings," an expression sufficiently ample for all that geology claims. This period was also the period of winged fowls, a fact well established by geological science.

It is affirmed that all the swarms of the seas and the flocks of the heavens were made after their kinds; and, after all that can be justly said relative to changes produced by cultivation, change of climate, domestication and crossing, it is still as true that the eagle's egg will not produce a turkey, as that "men do not gather figs of thistles, nor grapes of thorns."

Following up the scale of animated nature, approved both by Genesis and geology, we come to the beasts of the earth, contradistinguished from cattle, the former roaming abroad on the earth, and the latter preferring the haunts of even uncivilized men. These were made after their kind. That wild animals may be domesticated, and tame animals may become wild, we do not dispute. Nor does Genesis deny the fact. But with this change the panther would not become a pig, nor would the pig become a bear. Crossings may be made within certain limits, beyond which we can not go. There can be no crossing between a sheep and a deer, nor between a swine and a bear. At the time Genesis was written, animals were classified as now, so far as that book goes, and we see no good reason why we should depart from that classification.

Last in the ascending scale, according to Genesis and geology, comes Adam, man—human beings, both male and female. Geology subdivides time into ages, beginning with the Azoic, and ascending thus: The Azoic, or age without life; the age of mollusks, or invertebrate animals, having soft, fleshy bodies; the age of fishes; the carboniferous age, or the age which produced abundance of coal plants; the reptilian age, or age distinguished by numerous reptiles; the mammalian age, or the age of the highest class of animals having a spinal column, and characterized by the female nourishing its young at the breast; and the age of man. This scale is made from the best data furnished by geological observation. It places man last in the ascending scale, as does Genesis. The question, How did the writer of that book come to know this scale long before there was any such science as geology known? is one easy to answer by those only who believe that it was revealed to him by the Originator of all these things.

The philosophy of life, by which we mean a knowledge of vital phenomena as explained by, and resolved into, causes and reasons, powers and laws, is a very comprehensive and complicated subject, into which Genesis and geology do not enter, and, consequently, they do not here disagree. It is divided into two kinds—vegetable or plant life, and animal life. We mention plant life first, because it is the most ancient. The nearest approximation of these two lives is entirely below the view taken of them by Genesis and geology, it being in the microscopic regions. They approximate so nearly there that the line between them is not yet distinctly drawn. But we are

not thence to infer that they are the same; *because the fuller development of them shows that they are not identical.* Vegetable life, in its fullest extent, is found in the largest trees, and animal life in the largest animals, between which the difference is too great for identification. Vegetable life is the same through the whole plant kingdom, however different the innumerable plants may be. The same is true of the animal kingdom. The larger and the more perfect the plant and the animal, the fuller the development, and the more striking the difference between the two lives. To insist that they are the same in their original condition, because we can not mark the separation, is to reject the proof which they both furnish in their development. How things so different from each other as a tree and an elephant could have come from the same germ of life, originally, is more difficult to explain than to draw the separating line between the first plant life and the first animal life. The facts in their history show that they were not originally the same; otherwise how could they have become so different, under the unchangeable laws of nature, for which scientists so zealously contend? Under such law, all must have remained alike. They must all have remained vegetable or all become animal. Or, if another unchangeable law had intervened, called the law of evolution, by which the lowest form of life developed into the highest, we must expect to find the lowest animal life developed from the highest vegetable life. In that case we would find the lowest animal life evolved from the highest vegetable life—from trees, for instance—not in the waters nor in the atmosphere. The ascending scale requires this. Instead of this, we find the lowest animal life clear down with the lowest vegetable life, and so near to it that the line can not be accurately drawn between them. Is this evolution? This is a strange unrolling or unfolding. We can understand evolution in respect to the extraction of mathematical roots, but not in the sense of one life changing into another so decidedly diverse. Vegetable life is dependent on the earth and atmosphere directly; but animal life indirectly, by the products of these agents. No animal can live by eating soil only, however highly manured, and by breathing atmosphere. The soil produces vegetables, which are food for animals, and these become food for other animals. The properties of the earth must be either vegetableized or animalized before they can nourish animals. They must first be vegetableized. The chemical substances of the

soil which nourish vegetables, as obtained in the laboratory, are not the food for animals. No man would select a laboratory for a boarding-house, knowing that the table would be furnished with such materials for food, nor would he accept oxygen and hydrogen for drink. He would accept the products of the soil for food, and the proper combination of oxygen and hydrogen for drink, especially if it contained a strong infusion of tea or coffee.

The objection to the truth of Genesis, because it has not instructed us in the matters before mentioned, is equally good against the truth of geology. Some men infer the ignorance of the ministers of Christ on these subjects, because they do not preach and write concerning them; and some of them oppose them. By the same rule we may infer their ignorance of God's revelation, because they do not discourse and write about it, and some of them oppose it.

We are for science and the Bible both; and we are happy in the belief that there are many ministers who have at least a respectable knowledge of the sciences generally. We take pleasure in saying that we feel kindly to men of science, and that we are under many and great obligations to them for the little we know of these matters. We ask them to treat us kindly and fairly, as we are disposed to treat them. There can be no good intention in treating religion with disrespect, and in robbing poor mortals of the hope of a future and a better life.

The doctrine of the evolution of the human species from the animals is contradicted by the facts in Genesis and geology. The ascending scale is recognized in the animal as well as in the vegetable kingdom; but in neither is the theory of development, in the sense of one species evolving or evolving another, justified by facts. That all animals of every kind originate, and have originated, from eggs, ever since the first eggs were "hatched," is a fact admitted by all respectable naturalists. These eggs are also of the same character. The sum of their distinguishing qualities, by which they are known as eggs, is the same. We are not to infer from this fact that they are all of one kind; and that therefore all animals have descended from one primordial kind; for there are more kinds of eggs than one; and this is the only reason why there are more kinds of animals than one.

Every kind of animal, in its origin, must have existed either in an egg, or have been "created after its kind." The question, "Which

was first, the egg or the hen?" has puzzled many. If we say, "The hen existed first," then comes the question, "How can there be a hen without an egg?" The only rational answer to the question of the *genesis*, or origin, of every thing is, *God made it; and made it after its kind*. This is true whether eggs or hatched animals were first. If he made the eggs, or seeds of things, and placed them in circumstances which developed the animals and plants, he is the author of all thence proceeding. It would seem that the inhabitants of the earth and of the seas sprang from eggs or seeds, from the expressions, "Let the earth *put forth* shoots, herb setting seed, fruit-tree bearing fruit after its kind," and "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living beings."

Geology, in its most ancient discoveries, recognizes the different species of things, in both the vegetable and the animal kingdom, as strongly marked as they are now. It knows nothing of evolution, in the technical sense. It recognizes the fact that things existed in the Palæozoic time, as now, each "after its kind." Hence the division into radiates, mollusks, articulates, and vertebrates, with all their vast subdivisions, "after their kinds." The idea that older species developed new ones, because the latter succeeded, and surpassed, in perfection of organism, the former, is purely imaginary. The inference that, because the bones in a man's skeleton can be compared with corresponding bones in a monkey, bat, or seal, he must, therefore, in his origin, once have been a monkey, a bat, or a seal, is without premises, and therefore illogical. The differences between these animals are so many and so great that the evidence to the contrary is positively overwhelming. If a few correspondencies suggest the identity of origin, will not a hundred differences correct the suggestion? Or is the negative evidence to be rejected for the sake of a groundless theory? Suppose this is true of other parts of these animals, is there no difference between them? Is a man a monkey, a bat, or a seal? And if the correspondence in one case proves that the man was once a monkey, will it not also prove that he was once a bat, and once a seal? Will not the negative evidence, so vastly preponderating, in so many differences, prove the reverse? The correspondences can prove no more with reference to the past than with reference to the present. If, therefore, they prove that man once was a monkey, a bat, or a seal, they will

prove that he is still the same; for these correspondencies still exist. The man is what he is, the monkey is what he is, the bat is what he is, and the seal is what he is. Are they identical? *If the correspondencies prove any thing of sameness relative to the past, they must prove the same with reference to the present also.* We admit the correspondence,

"But a man 's a man for a' that,"

and a monkey is a monkey, a bat is a bat, and a seal is a seal, for all that.

But it is said that "man is developed from an ovule" "which differs in no respect from the ovules of other animals." Had the amiable author said "in no" perceivable "respect," he would have been accurate. But, in speaking unqualifiedly, he has affirmed what is not true. If the ovule differs "in no respect from the ovules of other animals," why does not the ovule produce the other animals instead of man? or the ovules of the other animals produce man instead of the other animals? That science can detect no constitutional difference we freely admit. But that there is a difference is proved beyond dispute; for the ovules produce different kinds of animals. There is, then, a difference which even the microscope can not detect, and on which the various kinds of animals entirely depend.

We submit these statements, brief as they are, as a full answer to all that Mr. Darwin has said in the way of argument in his book on the "Descent of Man," while we acknowledge our obligation to him for the great variety of information which his book contains; and we fall back upon the non-conflicting testimony of Genesis and geology in reference to the matters on which they both speak.

Will the patient reader permit us to say, that the statement of Genesis relative to the origin of things is, to us, the most direct, clear, unornamental, and sublime statement we have read on that subject? It, without claiming to be a scientific work, anticipates all the facts of geology relative to what it speaks, long before any such science was known, and presents the seal of truth revealed; and truth confirmed by the later researches of men of science and sound learning.

VIII.—THE QUESTION OF THE HOUR.

IT may be safely affirmed that, in the life of every man, there is a crisis. There is a day in our history for which all other days were made. There is one eventful moment of our existence into which is compressed all the mysteries of life and death. It is that hour of surpassing moment when the soul turns the glance of its vision inward, and realizes, to the fullest degree, its lost and sinful condition. Indeed, there can not enter into the human mind a conception of more unutterable sorrow, more wide and dreary desolation, than the state of an immortal soul when it is conscious that it is living "without God and without hope in the world."

And in this self-same conscious hour of its conviction, realizing the helplessness of an impenitent condition, recognizing the unsatisfying nature of earthly pleasures, and knowing that unanswered longing and deepest distress can be its only portion if the call of duty is unheeded, it is at last brought to that critical juncture when it cries out from the depths of its agony, "What must I do to be saved?" Yes, it is the old, yet ever new, query in the hearts of all humanity, the great problem of life and death. And it is none the less important to-day, though it has gone surging up and down the stormy hearts of millions of weary lives since that eventful night, so long ago, when it burst from the quivering lips of the Philippian jailer. Not only so, but the answer of the apostle, which brought peace and joy to the keeper of the prison, can not fail to bring peace and joy to every sinning and sorrowing heart that is asking that question to-day.

The old Gospel which was preached, heard, and believed the self-same hour of that far-off night, is to-day "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." The holy Christ, who stood transfigured in the hearts of his bruised and wounded disciples amid the painful circumstances of those perilous times, is the same Lamb of God who stands knocking at the door of every human heart which has thus far refused him entrance. The promise of the Holy Spirit is just as certain of fulfillment now as it was on the glad day of Pentecost, when thousands bent the knee to the Christ whom they

had slain. Yea, though the world advances, and science sweeps onward with mighty strides, there is no progress in the method of saving immortal souls. The scheme of redemption most fitly represents its Author in the majestic fact that it is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." It stands pre-eminent above the puerile attempts of man's finite wisdom to better the condition of a lost humanity, and treads forth in the conscious dignity of its own godlike independence of human machinery, and in its triumphant ability to redeem a sinful and ruined world. It is the star of hope to the nations that sit in darkness, and the haven of rest to the tempest-tossed of every clime. It creates no false hopes in the human soul, and promises nothing that it will not fulfill. Its deep foundations rest upon the Rock of Ages, and in the magnitude and splendor of its proportions it lifts its proud summit to the glory of the highest heavens. There is no far, outreaching limit that is not embraced within the scope of its generous capacity. There is no height which scornful pride may have attained that it can not hurl to a common level, and no depth of degradation which it can not lift into the ineffable beauty of a nobler life. Like God, its Author, it is "no respecter of persons," yet earnestly desiring and striving to bring all men to the enjoyment of its own inestimable blessings. And when the poor, distracted hearts of the children of men are torn by conflicting doubts and fears, as they seek to know what they must do to be saved, this plan of redemption is unfolded like a scroll, whereon they may read in glowing characters the words of eternal life.

Such is the scope of this divine conception for the salvation of the world. Now, although it may be the desire of many who are remarkable for their zeal in the advocacy of the truth to engage in controversy with all who oppose them, yet he who has the cause of God and the good of mankind most at heart will not enlist his services in discussion for the purpose of gaining a personal victory, but simply with the holy desire to establish the truth of God's Word. And in answering the innumerable cavilings and objections of captious men, who have no desire to know the truth, but seek rather to detect imperfections and flaws in the Christian system, we can only be animated with the laudable desire to vanquish error and defend the truth that shall make us free. Hence it is that we approach the investigation of a subject of so great moment with no doubt of a full and satisfactory result.

The man who is patiently striving to "know the way of the Lord more perfectly," has nothing to fear from the result of his labors. He brings to the consideration of every topic a mind that is unbiased by any sectarian prejudice, and is open to the conviction of God's truth wherever he may find it. It is the bigot alone who trembles with cowardly fear to tread the borders of truth's mighty realm, where God is lord of the conscience, and Christ the redeemer of the soul.

When we come to consider the numerous cases of conversion as related by the sacred historian, the fact is every-where patent that no instances have given rise to more discussion than these. Notwithstanding the circumstances attending these events have been presented with marked fidelity and simplicity, yet their meaning has been so perverted, and their deep significance so distorted, to suit the convenience or idea of some particular theory, that a thousand evils have grown from these painful misconstructions of the Word of God. The cause of this wide discrepancy in opinion may be attributed to the fact that men endeavor to construe these historical accounts in a manner suitable to their own individual theories, instead of conforming their opinions to the teaching of the Word. Thus, in the case of the jailer at Philippi, which is under consideration, it has been wildly conjectured by certain restless minds that the keeper of the prison was simply anxious concerning his immediate safety. To establish this theory, they advance to say, that, under the Roman law, the warden of a prison who had been negligent of duty so far as to permit the prisoners to escape, suffered the penalty of death. And this was true, strange as it may seem when contrasted with the practice of modern days! But, though, in the present instance, the jailer was apprehensive of personal danger, as evinced by his endeavor to take his own life, yet a thorough investigation of the facts will satisfy us that a far deeper significance lay beneath his questioning cry to the apostles. His effort at self-destruction was made while yet ignorant of the fact that his prisoners had not escaped, and the noble spirit of the Roman could not, for a instant, brook the idea of suffering an ignominious death at the hands of the law. Though he was not culpable, as he well knew, in the present instance, yet the thought must have flashed into his mind with lightning rapidity, that there was no hope of establishing his innocence before the Roman judiciary, that an unjust and shameful death must be his fate. In this

dire extremity, what could he do but take his imperiled life in his own hands? That he was about to do a weak thing, an unmanly act, a deed most cowardly, can not be denied in the light of these later and better times. But we must not forget the established code of honor among the ancients, nor the peculiar discipline to which this man was subject. In his mind the idea of suicide took the form of a most brave and honorable act. True, he recognized, as all men must in a similar position, that it was the last resort, that no other alternative was left him, and that he stood on the farthest extremity of mortal life, with no hope in that future where he was about to plunge. Is it, then, a cause for astonishment that he should be arrested in his reckless career, and pause to hearken to the clear, strong voice of Paul, as it rang through the prison: "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here?" In that supreme moment of his life, all the events of his past career must have risen to his mental gaze, and revealed the loneliness of his forlorn and helpless condition. The very character of the question which he put to the apostles is indicative of the fact that he had some conception of this salvation which he was seeking. Doubtless, he had listened to Paul on the preceding day, as the apostle discoursed of "righteousness and temperance, and judgment to come." And although it is not thus distinctly stated, yet we feel warranted in the assumption that these themes occupied the mind of Paul no less at that time than when subsequently he stood in the presence of the trembling Felix, and demonstrated the power of the world to come. So, then, it will be seen that the jailer realized his critical spiritual condition, and had some idea of this salvation of which he had heard. To intimate that he had a just and proper conception of the subject, in all the magnitude and grandeur of its proportions, would be an assumption unwarranted by the facts; but it is sufficient to know that he was conscious of his sinful state, that he saw, dimly though it was, that there was something of peace, and joy, and hope in this world, which he had never found, and of which he yearned in his longing heart to know. This question did not arise in his heart on the previous evening, when he closed the doors against the bleeding disciples. It gave him no anxiety in the midst of health and prosperity, when he stood in no jeopardy of life and fortune. No! It is the old, ever new story, repeated again and again in the history of ten thousand lives. When you press home to the

hearts of men the requirements of the Gospel and the necessity of obedience, they hear you with fretful impatience or languid indifference, and waive the real question at issue, with the words of a hesitating, cowardly Felix, "Go thy way for this time ; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee."

Amid the soothing influences of a fancied security, in the full vigor of health and strength, surrounded by friends and comforts innumerable, deluded by the false glamour of prosperous appearance, and strong in the confidence of victory through self-effort, the soul of man goes forth to brave the conflict, with the delusive hope that it can win the battle unaided by any power divine. It is not in the day of prosperity that men are brought to God. It is amidst the awful storm of misfortune, when the fierce blast of adversity hurls them to the dust, that they lie in the ashes of heart-broken penitence and grief. It is when their lives, with all their lofty aims and proud ambitions, with all their high hopes and splendid dreams, and pictures of future glory, when these poor, broken and shattered lives lie scattered in a thousand fragments, the wretched remnants of former beauty and power ; it is when, sitting down amidst the fallen columns and crumbling arches, surrounded by the wide desolation of a wasted and misspent life ; it is then that they lift their streaming eyes and imploring hands to heaven, and cry, from the depths of their agonizing hearts, "What must we do to be saved?" Do you stop for a moment to raise the trifling and captious query as to *what* it is from which these men seek this salvation ? Can you be so lost to all consciousness of the real wants of your own being, or the nature of the rewards which this world provides, as not to know that men are seeking salvation from something else than mere poverty or hunger or distress ? No ! It is the cry of a lost soul for eternal life. It is the earnest inquiry of a penitent heart for forgiveness. It is the humble entreaty of one who is crying from the depths of his own degradation, and longs to be lifted into the purer atmosphere of a nobler life. It is the hunger in the soul of the prodigal for a mansion in his Father's house, and the love and care of a heavenly home. It is the consciousness, which may come slowly or swiftly, but which must come sooner or later, that upon the soul there rests a heavy load of sin and guilt which only Jesus Christ can take away. And though it can not be said that this Philippian jailer understood the

scheme of redemption other than in a very limited degree, yet the fact is patent to every observing mind that he realized his need of forgiveness and salvation from his sins. He came trembling, as every man must come, and not self-confident, like the haughty Pharisee, who proudly rejects the offer of peace and pardon. Thus we discover the cause of this most important of all inquiries, and are ready to hearken, with the anxious jailer, to the response from Christ's ambassador.

Amid the host of conflicting opinions in the world of theology, which is but another name for the world of contention, it is with the most gratified sense of pleasure and relief that we turn to the clear pages of God's holy Word, and there learn the answer to the question of "what must I do to be saved?" But before entering into an analysis of the facts in this story of the jailer's conversion, it is well to consider the subject of generalization, by which a correct deduction of the truth may be drawn. For whereas the question itself is so general in character as to be the common inquiry of all mankind, yet the reply, in the case of the jailer, was of that specific nature which shows it was adapted to the wants of a particular condition. To those minds who read only to cavil, and look only to detect a blot, it may seem a difficult task to reconcile the various and apparently conflicting answers to this vital question; but when we are capable of "richly dividing the word," and approach its investigation with unprejudiced minds, the light which is inherent with the Gospel will be sufficient to render it at once clear and evident. There can be no difficulty when we collect the numerous replies to this question concerning salvation, and arrange them in such a manner as to discover the elements peculiar to each individual instance, from which a reply can be framed that will cover the entire ground. Nay, more, it is not too much to say that the spirit which seeks to contract the essentials of pardon to the narrow limit of but one requirement, is at variance with the broad and comprehensive scope of the Gospel. So, then, when we regard the answer of the apostle, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house," we can not accept it as conclusive evidence that this was equivalent to being saved by faith alone. Establish this proposition, and you destroy the argument of James, who has most distinctly declared, in words which can not be misunderstood, that "faith without works is dead." Now,

when we take into consideration the several meanings of the term, how it is sometimes used separately and as a thing in itself, and in other instances as productive of repentance and obedience, we can readily comprehend the fitness of this reply to the jailer. Paul did not enjoin upon him a dead faith, but one from which would flow the issues of a pure and spiritual life. And the sequel shows that the faith of this man was not only vital but eminently intelligent, resting, as it did, upon the sure foundation of knowledge drawn from the Word of God; for it is distinctly stated that Paul and Silas "spake the word of the Lord to him, and to all who were in his house." It might not be improper to drop the reflection that it is not at all probable that Paul would speak the Word of the Lord to creatures who could not, in the very nature of things, comprehend a single sentence he uttered. His preaching was addressed to such individuals as could properly comprehend his meaning, and had the ability to think and decide for themselves; and it is to such persons that the Gospel should be presented to-day, for they alone have the power to believe and obey it. The idea of unfolding the wonderful scheme of human redemption to a mind that is not, as yet, conscious of its own existence, is at once sacrilegious and absurd; and to say that Paul, in speaking the Word of the Lord to all who were in the house of the jailer, addressed himself to immature minds or irresponsible persons, is to charge upon the apostle a crime of the gravest and most serious character. Paul never wasted his energies. He never indulged in idle words. Life was too short, and time too precious, to be frittered away in meaningless words and actions. He lived too constantly "under the powers of the world to come" to give men a careless or unsatisfactory reply when questioned concerning their soul's eternal welfare. And so, when this trembling jailer appealed to him thus earnestly to know what he must do, the apostle sent back just such an answer as could be given under circumstances of a similar nature. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ" were the words best adapted to the jailer's condition. Being a heathen, he knew little or nothing concerning the Savior and the purposes of his life and death, save what he might have gathered incidentally from those around him. The first and necessary requirement of him, as of every sinner, was *a living faith in the Son of God*. And we have no evidence that he possessed this faith until the Word of the Lord had

been preached to him—till the apostle had given him a groundwork of knowledge upon which to rest his faith. That "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God, is a proposition not only substantiated in the conversion of the jailer, but abundantly proven by every instance of a sinner's conversion, from the day of Pentecost till now. Faith is no less the moving, vitalizing principle of the Christian life than the magic power by which an entrance is gained into the fold of Christ. It stands at the door as attendant upon the Redeemer, waiting to lead the sinner to Christ. It is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen;" and we know that "without faith it is impossible to please God." In its meekness and humbleness of heart it shows its entire willingness to submit to the will of the Redeemer, by casting its care completely upon him, and uttering the noble sentiment, "Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." It was this that the jailer required, and it was this that Paul preached to him as the first and necessary requisite.

If it be asked, why he was not enjoined to repent, as were the Jews on the day of Pentecost, the reply is, that Peter preached unto them Jesus until they were convicted of their sins, and convinced in their own hearts that this Jesus, whom they had crucified, was both Lord and Christ; and thus already believing the sublime truth, it would have been superfluous in the apostle requiring of them what had already been accomplished. On the other hand, to call upon the jailer to repent toward a Christ of whom he knew comparatively little, and, consequently, in whom he could not believe, would have been contrary to all laws of logic and philosophy, if not an outrage upon reason and common sense. Not only so, but because the word repentance is not to be found in this connection, is no evidence that it was not implied. Nay, we have abundant testimony to prove the existence of a lively and sincere repentance toward God in the heart and life of this man, when we observe the sudden transformation of thought and action, and the kindly act of washing the blood from the painful wounds of the disciples.

But, notwithstanding the faith which must have been produced by the apostle's preaching, and the repentance as evidenced in the actions of the jailer, there are, as yet, no signs of *rejoicing* in his heart, which is one of the necessary "fruits of the Spirit." Evidently, there was something of vital importance yet to be accomplished. If we glance

at the histories of the various conversions, whether of individual instances or taken collectively, it will be seen that the preaching was always adapted to the immediate wants of the sinner. To be more explicit, at whatever point the sinner had arrived in his knowledge of duty and the performance of it, *there the preaching began*. But in no case, among the many that occurred, is it recorded where other than the natural and logical order was followed, requiring the sinner to *believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, repent of his sins, and be immersed into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*. And this is the only full, the only correct, and the only complete Scriptural and apostolic answer to the all-absorbing and vital question of "what must I do to be saved?"

Does any one ask me if I believe that baptism is essential to salvation? I answer back, in the light of God's eternal truth, it is a matter of no moment what I believe, what I think, or to what theory I hold. What says the book? What says God? Let us resurrect the sublime sentiment of Augustine: "*Non valet, hæc ego dico, hæc tu dicis, hæc ille dicit, sed hæc dicit Dominus.*" Nay, let us not stop there, but go back still farther and hearken to the voice of Christ: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." And if it be objected that in the second clause the requirement of baptism does not occur, let it be answered that, if by the acceptance of certain conditions salvation may be gained, certainly it must logically follow that by the rejection of these same conditions, salvation is forfeited and the soul is lost. Not only so, but when we are taught that "he that believeth not is condemned already," it is at once plain why the Savior does not add the clause, and is not baptized, since baptism under such circumstances would not only be devoid of meaning, but have no efficacy whatever. And what does it matter whether it is essential or not? Why speculate as to the efficacy of an institution which is most assuredly divine? Has not God commanded? Has not Christ enjoined? Have not the apostles practiced? Why, then, will fallible man, in his finite wisdom, presume to question the utility of an act by which the Lord himself hath declared, "It becometh us to fulfill all righteousness?" And why, in the name of the God whom they profess to reverence and adore, will men who pretend to bear the Word of Life to a lost and perishing world so far forget their sacred

trust as to send back any other answer to the pleading petitions of trembling sinners than that which is given by the holy apostles of the Lord?

When I think of the sacred call to preach the Word of Life, that does not manifest itself by the "still, small voice" of some supernatural or miraculous agency, but is not other than the royal commission of the Christ, as it rings clear and thrilling and strong above the stormy discords of eighteen centuries: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned;" and when I think of the blessed promises which are contained in this same Gospel, and which will assuredly be fulfilled, and that this religion is not a cheat and a lie, but an eternal reality, and that the radiant Jesus is the only refuge and hope for a dying soul; and when I think of the deep and lasting curse which rests upon him who shall preach any other Gospel than that of the Lord and his Christ, and that men are false to the sacred trust confided to their charge, and throw the dry bones of their miserable, unsatisfying theology to famishing souls, as they would to dogs, and feed the hungry and the starving upon the lifeless husks of opinion, belief, and feeling; and when I see the reckless millions rushing on to inevitable ruin and death—I can no more wonder that a world is lying in wickedness, and that men are living "without God and without hope in the world."

O trembling, dying soul, delay not the hour of thy redemption, but hearken to the heavenly voice of Christ, "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy and my burden is light."

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*The Chaldean Account of Genesis.* Containing a Description of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the Times of the Patriarchs and Nimrod; Babylonian Fables and the Legends of the Gods from the Cuneiform Inscriptions. By GEORGE SMITH. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo. pp. 320. 1876.

ALTHOUGH George Smith is one of the youngest of the scholars engaged in Oriental studies, he is likely to become, if he is not already, the most distinguished of them all. His work on "Assyrian Explorations and Discoveries" at once placed him in the front rank of his co-laborers. But his present work is, upon the whole, the most valuable and deeply interesting of any that he has yet written.

Without attempting to give an analysis of the book, we call attention to its general character. It contains a number of Babylonian traditions which are calculated to throw considerable light on the Pentateuch. Although the legends, as they are given, contain many blanks, the evidence is already of the most valuable character in sustaining the Mosaic account of the Creation and the Flood. There can scarcely be any question that the Babylonian legends refer to the facts as recorded in Genesis, and, while there is considerable difference at points in the respective narratives, the difference is so immaterial as not to affect the general coincidence. While Genesis contains a straightforward statement, rather matter-of-fact in style, the Babylonian account is characterized by all the warmth and imagery of Oriental poetry. Hence, when we subtract the difference in style, we have substantially the same account.

Now, this must seem to the thoughtful student somewhat remarkable. At a time when the Mosaic records are being subjected to the severest examination as to their authenticity, and when the whole power of modern skepticism is ransacking every accessible source of evidence to overthrow the Bible, it must seem indeed very remarkable that just now, when most needed, these Babylonian legends should be brought to light, and that, too, under such strange and unlooked-for circumstances. We must not forget

that a portion of these records lay in the British Museum unobserved for several years, and that it was by an apparent accident that their value was first revealed. Through laborious efforts, careful manipulations, and conscientious painstaking, character after character has been restored to its proper place, until now the records are sufficiently perfect to enable Mr. Smith to give us a full translation of many parts, and quite enough of all the parts, to corroborate the authenticity of the Book of Genesis.

Who can doubt that an all-wise Providence has been directing these discoveries? We must remember that it is just now that such a testimony is needed. And as it is immediately forthcoming, we can scarcely believe any thing else than that the whole matter has been overruled by divine wisdom.

Mr. Smith's book will be heartily welcomed by Biblical students, and will be read with deep interest, not only for the information it contains, but also for the novelty of its revelations. Think of legends that have been sleeping beneath the centuries being exhumed and translated at precisely the moment when they are most needed to vindicate the truth of the Bible. Does not all this seem like a romance? Does it not have the appearance of a plot in fiction? And yet this is not romance, it is not fiction, but veritable fact; and in this fact we read anew the evidence of the truth of God's revelation.

-
- 2.—*The General History of Greece.* From the Earliest Period to the Death of Alexander the Great, with a Sketch of the Subsequent History to the Present Time. By GEORGE W. COX, M. A. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 709. 1876.

WE are glad that we can commend this volume in the strongest terms. As a somewhat brief history of Greece, it is the best book in the English language. The following are some of the reasons for this opinion:

First. It corrects many errors that have been handed down in other histories as unquestioned facts.

Second. It makes a clear distinction between what is purely romance and what is history.

Third. It shows, as no other work has done so clearly, that the religious unity of the Greeks was the basis of their national existence. This we regard as an important matter, and one that will prove very suggestive to the people of this country.

Fourth. Many of the views are decidedly original. Hence, the volume gives us much that is fresh on a subject which we had supposed well-nigh exhausted.

Fifth. The author uses, with a great deal of success, recent discoveries in archæological and linguistic studies.

Sixth. The style is vigorous, perspicuous, and concise. There is scarcely

ever a word too many, and yet for a general history, every thing is quite full enough.

Seventh. The work is brought down to the present time, and therefore gives a good outline of modern Greece, which is certainly important in any complete study of a people whose history has always been of the greatest importance, especially to the people of this country.

There are many real, earnest students who will never read some of the more elaborate histories of Greece; in fact, these will be less and less read as the age becomes more and more practical, as it certainly is becoming. We see already that this is not an age for long essays, long sermons, long histories, or long any thing else that is to be read or heard. What the age demands is that every thing shall be put in as few words as possible. The telegraph and the daily newspapers have done the work for us in these respects. Grote will still be found in the best libraries; Thirlwall will not entirely be laid on the shelf; Curtius will be followed as a book of reference; but, for general use, Mr. Cox's general history will likely supersede all these. It gives us the whole matter, comparatively, in a "nutshell." We get practically all we want without going over much ground. And as men are not likely to go to New York by way of New Orleans, when they can save time and money by a direct line, so men are not likely to read histories that deal in out-of-the-way things, when they can get those that pursue a direct line, and thereby save to the reader both time and money. We do not say that this is always the best, but we do say that this is precisely the way that people look at it. And, as the rage is to have books of this kind, we ought surely to encourage the very best books that can be written on this air-line method, and this is precisely why we commend so heartily the work of Mr. Cox.

-
- 3.—*The Influence of the Holy Spirit in Conversion.* A Debate between Rev. Asa Sleeth, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Elder J. W. Randall, of the Christian Church. Cincinnati: Chase & Hall. 16mo. pp. 236. 1876.

THE readers of the *QUARTERLY* already understand our opinion of public debates. We have several times called attention to the folly of public oral discussion, and especially when held on subjects that have been debated over and over until it is simply next to impossible to say any thing new upon them. Now, as a matter simply of economy, is it worth while to publish a book, when all that the book contains may already be had in the market at perhaps a less price than is asked for the new-comer? If a man has something original to say, let him write it out and publish it. Or, if he holds a debate with some one upon a subject that has not been exhausted, it may be worth while to publish what the disputants say, as a contribution to the particular matter under consideration. But why it is thought necessary

to publish a discussion that contributes not a single new thought, and presents even old thoughts in a somewhat enfeebled manner, is beyond our power to understand, unless it be for purely selfish purposes. And, if the latter is the reason, then the sooner public condemnation shall become so pronounced that the whole thing will be stopped, the better. Now, we do not say all this because we desire it to apply specially to the book before us. These remarks ought to strike down a good many other books before they reach this one. The fact is, this is about the least pretentious of the many debates that have come under our notice; and is therefore least objectionable in the respect referred to. It discusses but one proposition, while most other debates discuss several. This one discusses a very *important* question, and in a style generally perspicuous enough, and sometimes quite interestingly; and, as it is of convenient size, and the cost not very great, it may be well enough for those who wish to examine the subject of Spiritual influence in conversion to buy it and read it. And yet, we suppose, the world might have got along without this book ever seeing daylight. At least we think the world would not have been set back very much if the book had failed to appear. We know one of the disputants personally, and know him to be a man of unblemished character and of fine practical sense, and he doubtless conscientiously believes that his book will be of great service to the cause of the truth. We do not say it will not. In the country where Mr. Randall labors it may be that the circulation of his book will do much good. The style in which it is written is popular, being almost entirely free from learned criticisms; and, on this account, the masses will be able to comprehend the arguments. All of which is highly creditable to the writers; for, if public discussions must be held on theological questions, they ought to be held in the language of the people, so that the people can understand them. Hence, for this reason, as well as for others that might be stated, we regard the present discussion as of more value than many we could name that are more pretentious. The old arguments are usually stated with considerable force, and always in such a manner that they may at least be understood. It appears that the disputants were about equally matched as to scholarship and ability; hence the victory is one of truth, and not of mere intellectual superiority.

-
- 4.—*A Comprehensive History of Methodism.* In one volume, embracing its Origin, Progress, and Present Spiritual, Educational, and Benevolent Status in all Lands. By JAMES PORTER, D. D. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Crown 8vo. pp. 593. 1876.

WHATEVER may be our opinion of Methodism in other respects, there is one thing in which there can scarcely be a difference of judgment; namely, Methodism, as an organized religious body, has shown itself to be possessed

of wonderful vitality. It has certainly come up through "great tribulations," and has won its present leading position among the denominations of Protestantism by its inherent strength, rather than because it met with special favor. It was always a *cross-bearing* religion, and, though loaded down with some very grave errors, it has, despite these, gone on conquering and to conquer. It has, however, some very popular elements in it; and the old-fashioned Methodism, on this very account, won rapid conquests in the rural districts. It suited the people; it addressed itself to their feelings; and the common masses are always moved more from the heart than from the head.

Methodism, as a theological system, was always full of inconsistencies. It claims to be Arminian, and yet its doctrine of conversion is as thoroughly Augustinian as is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. But no matter for these inconsistencies, the Methodist circuit-rider always had something that met the practical wants of the common people, and they did not stop to ask much about his theology, but accepted at once the homely truths which he presented, with the same heartiness that characterized his presentation of them.

In this way we account for the early and rapid spread of Methodism, especially in this country. While the Presbyterian was educating a ministry, and while the Episcopalian was arranging his robes and training his choir, and while the Baptist was working away at his doctrine of immersion and "effectual calling," the Methodist went to work in earnest, with a few practical truths, that reached the hearts of the people, and really left all these other questions to be settled as every man thought proper. A man could be sprinkled, poured, or immersed; a Church could have a choir or not, an organ or not, a surplice or not; and while an educated ministry was well enough in its place, it must not by any means supersede the necessity of those valiant knight-errants—the circuit-riders—who went through storm and tempest, through rains and snows, exposed to diseases, to perils upon land and upon water, and even to perils among robbers, bearing to the people the simple story of the cross, "the old, old story of Jesus and his love."

We have said all this in view of what Methodism has been. We confess we do not see the same promise for it in the future. We think it is rapidly assuming characteristics that will eventually place it among the feeble denominations; certainly, it will not be strong as it has heretofore been, as it is now rapidly losing its original peculiarities. But, whatever it may be in the future, it has already had a history that commends it to our highest consideration. No man, we think, can claim to be even tolerably well versed in a knowledge of Protestantism without being well posted in the past of Methodism. And this book of Dr. Porter is just what every man needs who wishes to have at his finger ends all facts relating to Methodism. Of course,

it can not take the place of larger works, nor is it intended to do this ; but, as a compendium, it is almost invaluable.

In reading the book, however, one must constantly keep in mind that it is written from a partisan stand-point. Dr. Porter is an intense Methodist, and is sometimes superciliously bigoted ; but this might reasonably be expected in view of his connection with the Methodist Episcopal Church. As a member of that Church, he is bound to eulogize it a little above measure. It should be said, however, that in many things he criticises unsparingly, and occasionally gives us a bit of real candor. Still it is a pity that the Church can not have a historian who would deal justly with it ; and who, at the same time, would give us the history without a deeply partisan coloring. This is what is needed for all the various denominations in this country. But, unfortunately, the histories of these denominations are written by their respective partisans, until we can say of them all a little as the Dutch squire said of the case he was hearing: said he, "while one lawyer was speaking, I gave him the case ; but when the other lawyer was speaking, I gave him the case." When we read one of these histories, every thing looks as if we were following the true Church, and no mistake ; but as soon as we take up another, we are quite willing to give that Church the case, and so on, *ad infinitum*.

Still we are glad to have these one-sided histories. They give us the facts at least. By and by some judicial mind will gather up these facts, and give us a work that will be worthy to live for all time.

5.—*Inside the Gates*. By J. HENDRICKSON M'CARTY, D. D. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Philips. 16mo. pp. 276. 1876.

THIS is a beautiful little volume both inside and out. In fact, the publishers seem to have put the jewels of thought in a physical casket quite in harmony with their beauty. This is well, and shows that publishers are beginning to understand that there is essentially a necessary correspondence between the literary style of a book and its physical appearance, and that a want of harmony between these is a defect that will not be much longer tolerated by the culture of modern life.

The author tells us that he is indebted to a little dying girl, not much over half a dozen years old, for the title of this work. "The little sufferer was nearing the gates of the celestial city. Her watching father sat by her bedside, holding the hand of his dear child in his own, while his face was wet with tears. In a moment of ease, for she was a great sufferer, she looked up into that tearful face, and said, 'Papa, do n't cry ; I'll be just inside the gates when you come.'" And the author continues: "What could have been said more touchingly beautiful than that? How full of cheer! How full of comfort! What stronger chain is there to bind the heart of a

stricken parent to the gates of heaven than the knowledge that a dear child was inside those gates?" He then goes on to tell us that he is writing from experience, that he knows what it is to be "joyful in tribulation," and that he writes what he has felt as well as thought.

All this certainly furnishes a good start for an interesting volume, and we think that no one will be seriously disappointed in what follows. The book belongs to a class that has always been sought for and very generally read; and, while we are not sure that the influence of such books is, upon the whole, extremely beneficial, there is a fascination about them that disarms all criticism, and brings us at once into close sympathy with their spirit.

But we ought to say for this volume, that, while its title-page suggests the idea of death and the spirit land, its subject-matter is mainly about the present life. And this is precisely why we regard it with so much favor. It discusses, with very considerable insight, the true philosophy of child-life, child-culture, and especially that spiritual training which is necessary to the development of a true manhood and womanhood.

The style is simple and tender, and the book will be read not only by those who have little ones "inside the gates," but by those also who are seeking to bring up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

-
- 6.—*The Nature of Light.* With a General Account of the Physical Optics. By DR. EUGENE LOMMEL. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 356. 1875.

THIS is unquestionably the most satisfactory treatise upon the nature of light, that has yet been published. It is not only able in its manner of treating the subject, but it uses all the latest discoveries, and therefore presents us with all that can be said up to the present date. While the style is popular, it is thorough enough for practical use. Most of the discussions are quite elaborate, and generally exhaust the subject. The illustrations are numerous, and do much to bring every thing to the comprehension of the reader. We regard this as one of the most valuable contributions to popular science that has yet been published of the "International Scientific Series."

-
- 7.—*Songs of Religion and Love.* By JOHN STEWART BLACKIE, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. 16mo. pp. 242. 1876.

It is exceedingly difficult to fix a true standard by which to judge poetry. Poetic feeling is so variable, and the subjects upon which poetry is written are so numerous and widely different, that it becomes almost impossible to determine with any thing like certainty the boundaries within which

poetry must be confined. Hence the varied opinions with regard to certain authors. Still, there are some qualities that ought to belong to all poetry. Among these may be named heat. Poetry without some kind of warmth, no matter how artistic it may be, is clearly the name without the thing, the shadow without the substance. And this brings us to notice the chief defect in Professor Blackie's poetry. It seems to us that his poetry lacks heart power. He seems to be writing with a view to express certain thoughts in rhythm, rather than to express certain rhythmical thoughts that come unbidden from the heart. Hence his songs are not such as will take hold of the people. They may be read for their artistic finish, and for the truth which they convey, but they will never be remembered in detail as songs of true poetry. Men will quote Blackie's truth, but not his words. Men may sing his thoughts, but not his measures. In a word, Professor Blackie is a vigorous thinker and good writer, but can hardly be reckoned among the true singers, of whom it can be said that they give us "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn."

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Souvenirs D'Orient, Damas, Jerusalem, Le Caire.* Par J. AUG. BOST. (Memories of the East, Damascus, Jerusalem, Cairo. By J. AUG. BOST.) Paris and Neufchatel: Sandoz and Fischbacher. Large 8vo. pp. 406.

Books of travels in the East are no longer rare. Especially since the facilities of travel have so greatly increased, both on sea and land, a constant stream of intelligent, eager pilgrims of science, religion, general knowledge, and pleasure, is pouring yearly over the renowned regions and places of Western Asia, and of Egypt—pilgrims from all parts of the Christian world—from old Europe and from the remotest cities and villages of America. In this multitude of travelers are constantly those who feel the impulse, some who feel the duty, of telling their world what they saw and heard and learned. We have in many languages already truly valuable books of Oriental travels; some written with one purpose, some with another, many of general interest. To write well a book of travels is not every man's business. Some of these productions that we have seen are the most uninteresting things imaginable, written without intelligence, talents, or spirit—mere records of the barren events of a tourist's progress from place to place, not seldom resting for the real intelligence that is in them on the guide-books, which are now generally very excellent.

A well-written book of travels is, however, really valuable and refreshing ; and such a one is the book before us. M. Bost, a Genevan Protestant minister, was well qualified for his task. He is of mature years, an excellent scholar, and has established his character as a writer by a number of excellent books. Besides this, he was especially well prepared for a profitable journey in the East. For many years the desire of visiting those wonderful regions of the earth had burned like a strong, undying fire within him ; and every resource within his reach had been exhausted to make a thorough study of the Orient. But we had better let him tell this in his own manner.

"March 1, 1870, at five o'clock in the evening, we finally passed through the gate *de la Joliette*, and for the first time I seriously began to believe that I was going to see Egypt and the Holy Land.

"This had been a long dream with me, I might almost say a long cherished hope. As a child, I had represented to myself the scenes of the evangelical history ; I saw Capernaum, Nazareth, Bethlehem, and Gethsemane ; I had studied all the prints, good or bad, which the schools and bookstores furnished me. Even the plain maps of Palestine had a charm for me ; and in imagination I often made, always on the backs of camels, journeys which never ended. How often did I not travel from Jerusalem to Jericho ! How often with Saint Paul to Damascus ! And of the very journeyings of the Israelites in the desert, I knew perfectly well all the episodes ; those barbarous names had never frightened me. I said *Kibroth-Taava*, *Bene-Jahakan*, or *Rephidim*, as I could have said *Karnthal*, *Frankfort*, or *Geneva*.

"Later, the direction of my studies, in fixing still more my thoughts on the Orient and its riches, only gave a new aliment to my imagination. The Orient is the cradle of humanity ; it is also the cradle of Judaism, and that of Christianity, and of Mohammedanism ; it is the great theater of the Crusades, which have made modern Europe, and introduced the *Renaissance*, the revival of literature and the arts. Who knows ?—the Orient is, perhaps, even yet the key-stone of civilization ; we may turn as we please our looks to the setting sun, and make ourselves believe that it is from the West that light must come ; we need only repeat the magic word of *the question of the East*, and our old Europe is at once deeply agitated. It is the native land of these Jews, who are scattered to all the winds of heaven for eighteen centuries, and whom nothing has yet been able to destroy—neither persecutions, spoils, proscriptions, nor tortures, not even their own hardness of heart and unbelief. Involuntary witnesses of the Old and the New Scriptures, they are always here, looking toward the future ; that is, Jerusalem-ward, and recalling to us that, in spite of the contrary appearances, the center of the world is still there, as the Greek monks of the Middle Ages pretended to have discovered its material center, and marked it with a marble star.

"Among fellow-students we talked of these things, and put under requisition all the atlases, and all the accounts of travel, late or old, on which we could lay our hands. For us Chateaubriand was old, Lamartine a contemporary. But if, as a child, I was satisfied with a journey in spirit to the Holy Land, as a young man imagination no longer sufficed ; I wanted to see and touch with my hands ; I must go there in person ; it was a project, a plan, a resolution. By and by it became a fixed idea, and I forgot completely to think of the ways and means."

Finally, however, after many disappointments, and long hopes deferred M. Bost, when "the silver already began to brighten his hair," was able to realize this long cherished dream, every way better prepared than he would have been at any earlier period of his life. How well his studies had

qualified him (a matter so indispensable for a profitable tour) for his travels in the East may be seen from two of his own works published a number of years before: the first "The Period of the Maccabees," a history of the Jewish people, from their exile to the destruction of Jerusalem; the second, a "Dictionary of the Bible, or a Concordance of the Holy Scriptures, containing, in more than four thousand articles, Sacred Biography, Sacred History, Biblical Archæology, Biblical Geography, etc." A thorough and mature study of all things, classical and Biblical, ancient and modern, connected with the Orient, qualified our author well for a tour in the East, and for this work which he has given us.

The author's style is exceedingly pure, simple, and pleasant—really delightful. He is well prepared in mind and heart to understand and to appreciate and enjoy every thing that is interesting in his journey, and in easy flowing, happy style, in the pure French, he talks to us in the free spirit of a familiar friend. All this gives the book its charm, which every one must feel that reads. Mr. Bost reveals himself as a man of a noble, generous heart; with such a one we delight to hold converse, as we do when we listen to him in these pages. The book has throughout a strong, religious spirit and interest in it; and the fact that M. Bost is an *evangelical* Christian believer is beautifully revealed on every page. We knew this of him before; with *such* we delight to have intellectual and spiritual intercourse. The Orient, in all things appertaining to it, has been so much defiled and degraded by the desecrations of an unhallowed rationalism, that with its destructive spirit has labored, in countless books, to destroy the greatness and sacredness of that wonderful land, that it is truly refreshing to journey with a cultivated, enlightened, *Christian* scholar through its wonderful regions.

The caravan to which M. Bost attached himself, and which was under the control of Dr. Pierotti, familiar with Eastern travel, begins its course at Beyroot, whence it proceeded directly to Damascus. Our author thus describes the ascent of Lebanon:

"We follow, all rapt in thought, the road to Damascus; we leave to the right the American cemetery and the forest of pines of Fakr-ed-Din. We are yet in the plain, but a gentle slope brings us gradually to the foot of Lebanon, and the ascent begins. It will be a long one. We ought to have made this first stage in a trot; but, because of the poor riders among us, M. Pierotti judged best to proceed at a slow pace.

"The chain of Lebanon extends parallel to the sea, for a distance of a hundred leagues; some of its summits are more than three thousand metres high. It is a calcareous chain, that is ordinarily reckoned among the Jurassic strata. Its general aspect is majestic, severe. The name of Lebanon signifies white; some derive it from the eternal snows which cover its principal tops; others think that this appellation refers to the whitish color of those marly rocks that weary the eye. Firs, white-mulberry trees, olive-trees, vines, plane-trees, umbrella-pines, terebinths, carob-trees, some oaks, and the traditional cedars—too much extolled by some, too little appreciated by others—abound on the sides of the mountain, but without succeeding in hiding its arid and wild desolation. At intervals we meet with

picturesque villages, with the most pleasing surroundings; then comes the desert, dry and parched; the narrow line of the road we can trace in the distance, ascending, ever ascending, without a spring, or any trace of a human habitation. Sometimes in the bottom of a valley we see a silkworm nursery, a silk factory, mulberry-trees, water, some flocks of black goats hanging on the sides of the mountain, and a hundred feet beyond the solitude. We meet the *diligence* (stage-coach) from Damascus, drawn by three horses and three mules; it seems to us almost an imaginary apparition, so far removed are we from civilization.

"We journey on thus for some four or five hours. Every moment we turn round to enjoy once more the view of Beyroot and the Mediterranean. It is magnificent. Steamers are lying at anchor in the roadstead, an Austrian and a Russian. But the sun is burning, and we are already tired. We look instinctively around to see if we can discover any *heretery*; but, alas, we are far from any thing like that. Finally, Habib, our leader, dismounts; and one by one we all follow suit. Here we are to dine. Here?—where? Yet this place has really a name; it is called *Khan Haleck*. There is a little turf, but the grass is short and dry—not a single tree nor a bush. Antoine spreads out a carpet for us; this is our table, our umbrellas our only shade, and we prepare to do honor to our dinner."

Our author gives us some interesting notes on Damascus.

"The population of the city and the oasis is about from one hundred and fifty thousand to three hundred thousand souls; from the want of all satisfactory statistics, we are left to uncertain conjecture. The Mussulmans constitute the large majority; there are about five thousand Jews; and at least fifteen thousand Christians, of whom twelve thousand are Greeks, both orthodox and Catholics. The latest enumeration gives only seventy Protestants, but I have myself seen more; at the Arabic service of the Americans alone, there were more than sixty persons in the chapel; at the English service as many more, without counting the different schools kept by Protestants, which I visited.

"I have never before seen so many sects in one place; here are Greeks, Greek-Catholics, Syrians, Syrian-Catholics, Armenian-Chaldee Christians, Armenian-Catholics, Maronites, Latins, and Protestants. The last two branches of Christians enjoy the highest respect; this arises in part, doubtless, from their being less numerous, and therefore less feared; they excite less ill-will, and seek to make up for their small number by a greater activity, a more evangelical zeal, and by real service rendered to the people. The Sisters of Charity have founded a hospital, where every day a large number of sick people are gratuitously cared for. They enjoy, by reason of their charity, the peculiar privilege of going whenever they choose into the Grand Mosque.

"In like manner, also, the Lazarists, or Franciscans, and the Capuchins, or Cordeliers, have gained a good reputation, by the attention which they give to the education of the children, by their toleration, their hospitality and the purity of their lives. They possess, also, we may say in passing, a fine library."

The famous Emir, Abd-el-Kader, then living at Damascus, seems to have made a good impression on our travelers.

"On Saturday, thanks to our numerous and influential letters of introduction, we spent a profitable day. First, we were received at the French consulate, with the customary coffee, which is always *de rigueur*. Then we were received by the Emir Abd-el-Kader, also, with the traditional coffee. The Emir, of a noble, fine form, aquiline nose, fine mouth, piercing and very sympathetic eyes, was particularly agreeable to us. He always receives with especial pleasure the *Franchi*. He not only frequently took us by the hand, at the request of M. Pierotti gave us each an autograph, asked us about several persons he had known, and whom he supposed we also knew—especially M. Charles Eynard, of Geneva—but he even allowed us to visit the courts and gardens of the apartment of his wives, and accompanied us to these places; having of course beforehand given orders that these ladies should retire.

"This apartment had for us another interest than that of the forbidden fruit. The

fountains in the courts paved with marble, planted with orange and citron trees, the elegant roses and gillyflowers, were, of course, well worth seeing; but another interest attaches to these courts. It is here that in 1860, during the massacres of the Christians in Damascus, the Emir, the protector of the Christians, offered them an asylum, collected them, and saved a great number from a certain death. We could not forget this, when we talked to the man whom the Christians despoiled of his power, and whom they deprived so long of his liberty. He avenged himself by doing them good; and when we know the nobility of his sentiments, we can well understand the influence he was able to exercise over his co-religionists in Algiers. . . .

"The Americans and the English alone represent here evangelical Christianity. We visited their chapel on Sunday, and we heard, successively, two sermons—one from the missionary Crawford, in Arabic, which I did not understand, and which had some sixty auditors, Syrians and Turks; the other, from Mr. Scott, in English. The church is a fine, new one, the old one having been destroyed during the last massacres. A curtain crosses the room lengthwise, at right angles to the middle of the pulpit, so that the men and the women are entirely shut out from each other's sight, while all can see the preacher; this was the arrangement during the Arabic service.

"The number of Protestants is about two hundred, without counting in this number the English consul Burton, the traveler, the declared enemy of the Christians (it is said that he has turned Mohammedan). His predecessor was Mr. Rogers, now consul at Cairo, whose sister has published a volume, justly esteemed, on the interior of Jewish houses.

"We visited the school for boys, and the one for girls, as well as a boarding-school for young ladies, which are attached to the mission. Altogether, they have more than one hundred pupils, the most of whom are brought up in the Christian faith, and receive evangelical instruction, even when their intention is to remain Mussulmans. Besides this direct proselytism, these schools have the great advantage of bringing together the populations and religions that do not know each other, and of breaking down prejudices. I have no doubt that fanaticism will one day raise its head, and that the Damascenes, always violent, will recommence their massacres; but, in the meanwhile, a good work goes on, the number of proselytes is increasing, and the relations of Mussulmans and Christians become better.

"I may be allowed to add here an anecdote which was related to us, but for which I will not vouch, although it is not at all improbable. It is said that during his visit to the East some years ago, the Emperor of Austria, in a free and friendly conversation with the Sultan, asked his 'dear cousin,' to endeavor, as far as lay in his power, to induce the believers in the Crescent, not to call the followers of the Cross by the disagreeable epithet of *dogs of Christians*. The Sultan, as a man of good manners, promised this, and in turn begged the Emperor Joseph to do his best, on his part, to stop in Europe the odious practice of calling dogs of remarkable size or ferocity *Turk, or Sultan*. True or false, this story embodies a lesson; but I believe, that in this respect, the schools will have more influence than all the efforts of their imperial majesties."

M. Bost, however, does not cherish very great hopes of Christianizing the Mohammedans. He says:

"We must not entertain illusory hopes, and we must not expect, according to all human probabilities, to obtain any very great results from the evangelization of the Mussulmans. The climate, the religion, the politics, the fatalism, the idleness, the prejudices, the governmental habitudes, all co-operate to *fix* the disciple of Mohammed in the ideas in which he has been reared. And if, as happens sometimes, he can be brought to speak with respect of Jesus Christ, and as a great prophet, it is difficult to bring him any further, and above all to bring him to comprehend and accept the doctrine of redemption.

"Here, perhaps more than anywhere else, man remains what he was as a child, and we must bring our efforts to bear on the children. In this respect, the schools are the future of the Orient; through them a new generation is rising up, a new public spirit is forming. Beyroot, Damascus, Nazareth, Jerusalem, Egypt, are important centers, through the power exerted by the evangelical schools, the establishments for orphans, and all the charitable

institutions which have been growing up for some years in the midst of these populations. England and Prussia are using to this end their consuls; the Christians of every land are exerting their influence, and may always exert their influence, by their teachers, their evangelists, and deaconesses. Two or three thousand Syrian or Arab children, brought up in our institutions, will do more than four times that many soldiers for the regeneration of these countries. I believe that if the Christian nations had not compromised their position by their political action, the Crescent would have bowed before the Cross. But it is never too late to do good. Our Churches, that labor in so many places, should remember that here, too, there is for them a great work to do, a testimony to bear, and souls to save. It belongs to Christians, perhaps, to solve the question of the East."

The mere statesman, the Christian unbeliever of every class, will receive the hope, the faith here expressed of the possibility of the influence of Christian work on the East with all incredulity, with contempt perhaps. But more than once in the world's history has God, by the foolishness of the Gospel, brought to confusion the "wisdom of the wise;" and in the light of the Gospel, and of its history among men, the true Christian believer must never fail in his faith in God, in the Gospel, and in humanity.

2.—*Les Catacombes de Rome. Notes pour servir de complètement aux Cours d'Archéologie Chrétienne, avec dessins. Par Henri de l'Épinois, Chevalier de l'Ordre de Saint Grégoire le Grand; Ancien Elève de l'Ecole des Chartes.* (The Catacombs of Rome. Notes to Assist in Completing the Studies in Christian Archæology, with Illustrations. By HENRI DE L'ÉPINOIS, Knight of the Order of Saint Gregory the Great, etc.) Paris. 12mo. pp. 234. 1875.

To the historian of the early ages of Christianity, whether he be himself a believer or not, but especially to him who in Christian faith studies diligently the history of the Christianity of the first centuries, the antiquities of the early Church will always be a subject of the highest interest. These serve to illustrate, in a living form, the doctrine and life of the Church during the early period of its history. The discovery of the Catacombs near Rome gave a new impulse to the study of Christian archæology in offering a new and rich field of explorations. Here, in these vast subterranean galleries were found, often in a state of wonderful preservation, in great number, the tombs of the early Christians, with engravings, paintings, inscriptions, entablatures, and other monumental illustrations, furnishing the richest treasures to the student of the history of the Church at Rome, during the first four or five centuries especially. The earlier works on the Catacombs, by De Bosio, De Bottari, De Buonarrotti, and others, imperfect as they were, were received and studied with the most eager interest. But it was not till the discoveries of M. de Rossi, in our own day, were given to the world, in his "*Roma Sotterranea*" and his "*Bulletino di Archæologia Christiana*"—discoveries which are yet continued—that the world became really aware what an immense storehouse of Christian antiquities was buried in this vast subterranean necropolis of the Roman Campania. Here was found a Christian

Herculaneum and Pompeii, where we can now walk through the many winding streets of this great city of the dead, and look face to face upon the habitudes of the Christians of Rome fifteen centuries ago, when Rome was yet a heathen city, and when the Roman Papacy was yet unknown. The value of these discoveries as lights to early Christian history, and especially as most important and decisive witnesses to the state of the Christian Church of the first age, in many great points of controversy, could not be mistaken. Catholics and Protestants, with equal eagerness, have thrown themselves on the exhaustive study of the Roman Catacombs. As might be expected, here, as in the written Word, and as on other points of historical testimony, obstinate controversies have arisen between the two great and irreconcilable parties of the Christian name; Catholics seeking to draw triumphant support for the Papacy, Protestants as overwhelming proofs against it, from these silent, yet loud-speaking witnesses of the early past of the Christian Church. As illustrations of some of the capital points of the controversy between Catholicism and Protestantism, that are met by the revelations of the Catacombs, we instance inscriptions like the following:

"To Basilus, the presbyter, and Felicitas, his wife."

"Claudius Atticianus, leader, and Claudia Felicissima, his wife."

"Petrona, a priest's wife, the type of modesty; in this place I lay my bones; spare your tears, dear husband and daughter, and believe that it is forbidden to weep for one who lives in God."

Here is overwhelming testimony that celibacy, as a law for the ministry of the Church, was unknown in the early centuries. On no point have the Catacombs excited a greater controversy than that of purgatory and praying for the dead. The earliest inscriptions and illustrations on these tombs know nothing of this doctrine and practice, and clearly testify against them; yet the Catholic Church has striven hard, by ingenious interpretations, to draw this testimony over to its side. These very early inscriptions declare, in no doubtful words, that the Christian soul passed at once from the body to the peace of the bosom of God. If any one desires to see the ingenious methods by which the Catholic Church, in its most cunning, artful advocates, the Jesuits, seeks to use the voice of the Catacombs in its own behalf, and also how successfully these attempts are refuted, let him read a very interesting little book entitled, "*Mornings Among the Jesuits at Rome*," in which its author, the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M. A., a very learned and eminent Anglican clergyman, relates his interviews, and amicable but keen controversies, with eminent Jesuit Fathers at Rome, as they accompanied him as guides around the antiquities, especially the Catacombs of Rome. While the arguments are always on both sides most amicable and polished, they are, on the side of the Anglican, keen and trenchant as the genuine old Damascus blade, with merciless logic dissipating the subtle reasonings of his Jesuit companions.

The book whose title stands at the head of this notice is written by an ardent Catholic, a true knight of the Church, and, wherever it is possible, he brings the Catacombs to help of the Church. Nevertheless, in spite of this spirit which reigns throughout the book, it has many pages of interest and instruction, when the special honor of the Church is not in question. We give a few specimens by way of illustration. On the subject of Christian cemeteries, the author says, page 31 :

"The burial of the Christian was always a religious act. The priest prayed over the body, and on the anniversary of the burial he renewed these supplications to God, the judge of the living and the dead. Without doubt, the soul had departed from the body ; but this inanimate body was to be resuscitated in the last day, and united to the soul for an eternity. This is the reason why the burial of Christians was always regarded as a sacred duty ; so that the Roman priests, writing to the clergy of Carthage, were the interpreters of the sentiment of the Church, when they said : "*Quod maximum est, corpora martyrum aut ceterorum si non sepeliantur, grande periculum imminet eis quibus incumbit hoc opus.*"* The faith in the resurrection of the body inspired in Christians such a respect for this mortal envelope that they rejected, as a sacrilege, the idea of giving it to the flames. They took care, on the contrary, to wash it after death, to anoint it and embalm it with perfumes ; then to confide to the earth, in conformity to the best and most ancient customs, says Minucius Felix, this body, which was one day to rise again and appear before God.

"Moreover, although no law prescribed it, although Christians often had isolated crypts to receive the remains of their dead, they preferred, in place of scattering them here and there, to unite them with those of their departed brethren, but having a separate place for each one of them ; for they would not have allowed them to be thrown into common pits, such as were the *puticuli* of the heathens. Thus originated the *cemetery*, the place of sleep—*κοιμητήριον*—a word which at once reveals, as all the terms of Christian inscriptions, the faith in the resurrection.† This word denoted exclusively, by the consent even of the heathens, the common burial place of Christians. This usage of interring the dead was, however, not originated by the Christians ; these only followed tradition. The people of the East had built their sepulchers in the sides of hills, and we know that Abraham had his grave hewn in the rock of the valley of Mamre. In Palestine, as in Phœnicia, and in all the maritime stations of the Mediterranean, where the Tyrian fleets landed, the same custom was preserved. In Italy, the Etruscans constructed rectangular chambers to deposit there their dead. A capital difference, however, exists between the Christian sepulchers and the other sepulchers of an anterior epoch. The latter are only for the dead ; the chamber in which these are deposited is closed ; while the Christian sepulchers, built to be always easily visited, remain open to the living. . . .

"It must also be observed that the subterranean chambers (*cubacula*) were not generally re-established by the pagans until after the Christian era ; so that there is ground for believing that, the custom of burning the dead falling gradually into disuse, beginning with the Antonines, the subterranean sepulchers came into favor at Rome at the same time that the Christians excavated their cemeteries, and perhaps under their influence."

The *origin* of these vast subterranean excavations that constitute the galleries of the Catacombs has long been a problem, the solution of which has been beset with difficulties, and about which there is not yet entire unity of opinion. The easiest solution, and that which had always been generally received, was that these galleries were originally quarries, from which the

* "What is most important, if the bodies of the martyrs or of others are not buried, great peril rests on those whose duty this is."

† "*In Christianis*," says St. Jerome (Ep. 29), "*mors non est mors, sed dormitio et somnus appellatur.*" Among Christians death is not death, but is called *falling asleep*, and *sleep*.)

city of Rome had obtained building material. This opinion is yet the generally accepted one. It is, however, beginning to be seriously combated. And it is now maintained that the Catacombs are really entirely the work of the Christians as a place of deposit for their dead. Our author accepts this opinion. He says:

"By the examination of the arrangement of the cemeteries, of the direction of the corridors that traverse them, of the nature of the ground in which the Catacombs are excavated, Father Marchi (who had before maintained the old opinion) came to this conclusion: That the cemeteries were an entirely Christian work, begun to put in a safe place the bodies of believers, and not to dig out materials for building. He demonstrated that the *tufa*, in which these galleries had been dug, was not suitable for building, that no solid excavation could have been made in the puzzolana. And when he examined the texts cited in support of the old opinion, he was able to show that they had been falsely interpreted. The opinion put forth by Father Marchi, on the exclusively Christian origin of the cemeteries, was not accepted by all; it was even violently combated. Father Marchi replied, and the discussion appeared to rest; but it was necessary that the question should be definitely cleared up and settled. M. Michele de Rossi has very successfully taken it up, and by the most scientific observations, resting on determined facts, he has been able to accomplish the extremely difficult task of tracing the iconography of subterranean Rome, and to fix its origin.

"M. Michele de Rossi has discussed the nine texts of the "Acts of the Martyrs" and of the "Pontifical Book," in which the *arenaria* are mentioned. The philological proofs accumulated under his pen to demonstrate the meaning of the words *crypta*, *arenarium*, and the united words *crypta arenaria*. He has shown that the word *arenarium* alone signifies an excavation in the puzzolana, and that if, among the numerous Roman cemeteries, a very small number, four or five only, were named *arenaria*, it is because these exceptionally had been quarries. This word had then very properly been used in rare cases, but had been very improperly extended to other cemeteries. He proved that *crypta arenaria* signified not an excavation in puzzolana, but a cave dug in a sandy rock. But the most decisive argument pointed out by Father Marchi, and developed by M. Michele de Rossi, was drawn from geological observations in the Campania of Rome. Thus geology, this science that seemed altogether useless in the study of sacred archæology, has here given its aid. In fact, the soil of Rome presents three kinds of materials of igneous origin—the *lithoid tufa*, or true stone, suitable for building; the *granular tufa*, more or less compact, and more or less mixed with earth; the *friable tufa*, or real puzzolana. Now, observation shows that the ground in which the cemeteries of Rome are dug is precisely that of the *granular tufa*, that can not be used either as stone or as puzzolana. Some few excavations were pushed here and there into the puzzolana, but it can be easily seen that these were never begun in ground of this nature, and always after it was met, it was quickly again abandoned. The lithoid or stone tufa was too hard to be easily excavated; the friable tufa had not consistency enough to afford a safe support. If, then, the excavations were made in a ground unfit for building or for any other purpose, we must conclude that they were not made for profit or speculation. Besides, quarries (*latomia*) are well known. We know their form, their arrangement, and they can be compared with the excavations made by the Christians. The galleries made to extract the puzzolana are well aired; their breadth is often five metres (over sixteen feet), and at the point where two galleries meet, the angles are cut off and rounded, evidently to facilitate turnings. The galleries of the cemeteries are, on the contrary, narrow; their breadth is, ordinarily, from seventy-five to ninety centimetres only; very few have the breadth of a metre (a little of three feet); a few only have a breadth of one and one-fifth and one and a half metres; some are only from fifty-five to seventy centimetres broad. At the point of the intersection of two galleries the angles remain very sharp, instead of being rounded to allow the cars to turn. This arrangement is evidently opposed to the purpose of an industrial enterprise to extract building materials. A single example of a curvilinear gallery is seen in the second *area* of the cemetery of Calixtus."